

Classical Philology

VOLUME VIII

July, 1913

NUMBER 3

TRAGEDY AND THE SATYRIC DRAMA

BY ROY C. FLICKINGER

Could Dionysus have foreseen what contentions were to be provoked by the dramatic element in certain of his festivals, he would surely have taken to heart his own advice to Euripides in the *Frogs*: ἀπὸ τῶν χαλαζῶν ἀναγε σεαυτὸν ἐκποδῶν, τυφῶς γὰρ ἐκβαίνειν παρασκευάζεται. The origin-of-tragedy mongers are abroad in the earth, and their theories are promulgated with bewildering frequency. My present excuse for participating in the controversy is threefold: in the first place, I have a few small bits of evidence or of new interpretation to add to the discussion; secondly, I am convinced that proper solutions for most of the points at issue have already been proposed by others and need only to be assembled into a composite whole which will itself be new, though its constituent members are old; and thirdly, I wish to protest against some recent methods of procedure. Of course, our evidence is far from being as complete as we could wish, and must therefore be supplemented at many points by conjecture pure and simple; but this fact does not justify us in throwing all our data overboard and in beginning *de novo*. In this matter we have been too prone to follow a practice which the late Professor Verrall characterized, in a different connection, as follows: "We are perhaps too apt, in speculations of this kind, to help a theory by the convenient hypothesis of a wondrous simpleton, who did the mangling, blundering, or whatever it is that we require."¹ Now,

¹ Cf. *Euripides the Rationalist*, p. 243.

whatever may be true in other cases, Aristotle at least was no "simpleton," competent only to mangle his sources of information; and furthermore, apart from certain ethnographic parallels, which are of only secondary importance after all,¹ our fund of knowledge is in no wise comparable with his. In fact, except for the extant plays, our information is largely only what we derive, directly or indirectly, from him. Since this is so, what can be more absurd than to reject his conclusions and have recourse to unhampered conjecture? It has been counted a reproach to German scholarship that this is their favorite mode of procedure, but in the present line of inquiry it has remained for certain English scholars to leave their Continental confrères far behind.

But if we are to hold fast to Aristotle, one precaution is necessary—we must be sure that we do not make him say more or less than he does say. He wrote for a very different audience from that which now reads his words and for a very different purpose from that to which his book is now put; and these facts often render him enigmatical. This is due in part to the esoteric nature of his teaching, as Professor Margoliouth has set forth so brilliantly in the introduction to his recent edition;² but it is also due simply to his assuming a familiarity with some things which cannot now be taken for granted. As Professor Bywater expresses it: "It is clear from Aristotle's confession of ignorance as to comedy that he knows more of the history of tragedy than he actually tells us, and that he is not aware of there being any serious lacuna in it."³ Thus, Aristotle says (*Poetics* 1449a11) that tragedy arose ἀπὸ τῶν ἐξαρχόντων τὸν διθύραμβον. Though this expression unfortunately lacks precision, the main item, that the dithyramb is the parent of tragedy,

¹ Cf. Wilamowitz, *Neue Jahrbücher f. kl. Altertum*, XXIX (1912), 474: "Eins ist allerdings für die Gesamtauffassung der dramatischen Spiele von grosser Bedeutung, was erst durch die Beobachtung anderer Völker kenntlich geworden ist und in dem griechischen Kultus weithin zutage liegt . . . aber so wichtig das ist, es geht die Vorstufen der Tragödie (und Komödie) an, allenfalls die τραγῳδοί von Phleius, kaum die des Arion und ganz gewiss nicht die des Thespis," and pp. 282 f. below.

² Cf. his *Poetics of Aristotle* (1911), pp. 21 ff. I cannot, however, accept all the instances which he cites to prove this contention.

³ Cf. his *Aristotle on the Art of Poetry* (1909), p. 135. This opinion is confirmed by the fact that men of such importance as Thespis and Phrynichus are not so much as mentioned in the *Poetics*.

emerges from any interpretation. Let Professor Ridgeway¹ and the others proceed to derive the dithyramb from ceremonies at the tombs of heroes, if they choose—that would be at least logical. But to ignore this statement of Aristotle's and to seek, as they do, to trace tragedy back to such *δρώμενα* by another line of development transgresses good philological practice.

There is an unfortunate facility in such attempts. Tragedy embraced many diverse elements in its material and technique. Accordingly, whatever anyone wants, he can be almost certain of finding there. Thus Dieterich² with his theory of the development of tragedy from *θρήνοι*, the Eleusinian mysteries, and various *αἵτια*, Ridgeway with his tomb theory, Miss Harrison³ with her Eniautos-Daimon and sympathetic magic, and Professor Murray⁴ with his attempt to reconcile and expand the Dieterich-Harrison theories, all find confirmation for their views in the same body of dramatic literature. But the very facility of such analyzing is its undoing.

On the other hand, it is no less important to read nothing into Aristotle's language. In the immediate context with the above, he declared that the diction of tragedy became dignified only at a late date *διὰ τὸ ἐκ σατυρικοῦ μεταβαλεῖν*. This has generally been taken to mean that tragedy developed from the satyric drama—an interpretation which has involved several difficulties and has been pronounced inconsistent with Aristotle's other statement just

¹ *The Origin of Tragedy* (1910). At many points, Ridgeway was anticipated by Wilhelm Schmid, *Zur Geschichte d. gr. Dithyrambus* (1901), who developed an old idea of Welcker's (*Nachtrag zu d. Schrift über d. Aeschylische Trilogie nebst einer Abhandlung über d. Satyrspiel*, Frankfurt, 1826, pp. 248 ff.) and supposed a fusion of the democratic Dionysiac dithyramb and the aristocratic *Heroenkult* to have taken place about 600 B.C. under the auspices of tyrants (p. 26 f.). He would thus explain the introduction of non-Dionysiac themes (p. 25). But in Attica political conditions were not ripe for such an amalgamation before 560 B.C. nor staple enough until Pisistratus' third reign, and we have no evidence of Pisistratus' interest in such matters previous to 535 B.C. Schmid anticipated Ridgeway also (p. 19, n. 2) in advocating the dual origin of tragedy and satyric drama. Ridgeway is only willing to concede that the latter was Dionysiac from the first.

² "Die Entstehung der Tragödie," *Archiv f. Rel.-Wiss.*, XI (1908), 163 ff. (= *Kleine Schriften*, pp. 414 ff.).

³ *Themis* (1912).

⁴ *Ibid.*, pp. 341-63.

discussed. But Dr. Emil Reisch¹ has proposed another interpretation: "Gewiss ist es nicht berechtigt, ἐκ σατυρικοῦ kurzweg mit 'aus dem Satyrspiel' zu übersetzen. Aristoteles spricht vielmehr—wie Theodor Gomperz in seiner Übersetzung es zutreffend wiedergibt—nur von dem 'satyrspielartigen Ursprung' und von der 'satyrhaften Dichtung,' woraus zunächst nur eine Verwandtschaft, nicht eine Identität von primitiver Tragödie und Satyrspiel sich folgern lässt." In other words, early Attic tragedy never received the name of "satyric drama"—in fact, as I believe (cf. p. 282, below), its choreutae were silenoi, not satyrs—but it bore so many points of resemblance to the contemporaneous performances of σάτυροι in the Peloponnesus and to Pratinas' satyric drama in Athens at a later period that it could truthfully be said, in untechnical language, to have passed through a "satyric stage," to have had a "satyric" tinge which it was slow to lose. This interpretation is equally as possible as the old one and in my opinion is more fully in accordance with other data.²

¹ Cf. "Zur Vorgeschichte der Attischen Tragödie," p. 472, in *Festschrift Theodor Gomperz* (1902). This exegesis has now been accepted by Mr. Pickard-Cambridge, *Class. Rev.*, XXVI (1912), 53. Gomperz' translation (1897) reads as follows: "Was das Wachstum ihrer Grossartigkeit anlangt, so hat sich das Trauerspiel im Gegensatze zur ursprünglichen Kleinheit der Fabeln und der zum Possenhaften neigenden Artung der Diction ihres satyrspielartigen Ursprungs wegen erst spät zu höherer Würde erhoben. . . . Ursprünglich hatte man sich nämlich, da die Dichtung satyrhaft und mehr balletartig war, des trochäischen Tetrameters bedient."

² Ridgeway has recently proposed still another interpretation of διὰ τὸ ἐκ σατυρικοῦ μεταβαλεῖν (cf. *Class. Quarterly*, VI (1912), 244): "The word ὁφεί makes it plain that Aristotle was not referring to the first beginnings of tragedy in the sixth century or earlier, but to something which had occurred between 500 B.C. and 450 B.C., since not many lines farther on (1449b2) he uses ὁφεί of the period when the Archon first granted a comic chorus. But as it was only toward the latter part of the first half of the fifth century B.C. that comedy got this recognition, there seems little doubt that τὸ ἐκ σατυρικοῦ μεταβαλεῖν must fall somewhere within the same period. But this is the very period when tragedy was beginning to get free herself from the satyric drama, which was finally supplanted by the melodramas, such as the *Alcestis* which in 438 B.C. took the place of a satyric drama, in the tetralogy of which the other plays were the *Cressae*, *Alcmaeon*, and the *Telephus*. To the Greek the term *tragœdia* included both serious tragedies and 'sportive tragedy,' the satyric drama. So long as the truly tragic trilogy was followed by a coarse satyric drama, tragedy had not got free from ludicrous diction and attained to her full dignity." It will be noted that Ridgeway arbitrarily adds some thirty years to the first instance (the *Alcestis*) which he can cite of a substitution of a quasi-tragedy for the satyric drama. In order to equate this innovation with the epoch date of comedy, however, Ridgeway would have to go back still twenty years farther, for Wilamowitz' dating of the first comic chorus (*circa* 465

A bit of new evidence, first published almost five years ago, has only recently received the attention which it deserves. Joannes Diaconus' *Comm. in Hermogenem*¹ contains the following: τῆς δὲ τραγωδίας πρῶτον δράμα Ἀρίων ὁ Μηθυμναῖος εἰσήγαγεν, ὥσπερ Σόλων ἐν ταῖς ἐπιγραφομέναις Ἑλεγεῖαις ἐδίδαξεν. Χάρων² δὲ ὁ Λαμψακηνὸς δράμὰ φησι πρῶτον Ἀθήνησι διδασκῆναι ποιήσαντος Θεσπίδος. Of course, there is nothing surprising about these contradictory notices—Epigenes was also mentioned in the same connection. As Professor Morris says: "Properly understood, no form of art was ever invented."³ Who should be considered the founder of tragedy mainly depended upon the stage of development to which one was willing to apply that term. Living in the days before real (Aeschylean) tragedy and before the importance of Thespis' innovations was understood, and incensed at that playwright,⁴ it was but natural that Solon should both take an interest in the matter and

b.c.) is no longer tenable. This event happened in 487/86 B.C. (This date was proposed by Capps; cf. *Univ. of Chicago Decennial Publications*, VI, 286 f. [1904] and it has since been accepted by Wilhelm, *Urkunden dram. Aufführungen in Athen*, p. 175, n. 1.) It need not be said that Ridgeway has no warrant for adding either thirty or fifty years to 438 B.C. But even this procedure would not free him from his difficulties, for his main argument (pp. 242 f.) is the contention that the eight *μεταβολαί* which Aristotle enumerates in the history of tragedy "fall into two distinct classes, (a) external—actors, chorus, and scenery, and (b) internal—plot, diction, and meter," and that the items in each of these are arranged chronologically. The details of (a) do not now concern us. In (b) the separate items are: "(1) the short plot was succeeded by those of greater length, (2) it was only late that tragedy got free from grotesque diction by getting rid of satyric drama and became completely dignified, and (3) the meter changed from tetrameter to iambic, 'for at the outset they used the tetrameter owing to the style of composition being satyric and more suitable for dancing.'" Therefore, (3) must be later than (2); but we are expressly told that the tetrameter was employed "at the outset," and whatever interpretation we choose to give these words, the extant dramas show unmistakably that this metrical change did not take place after 438 B.C. or 465 B.C. or even after 486 B.C. The occasional use of the trochaic tetrameter in fifth-century tragedy does not, of course, discredit Aristotle's general statement that the iambic supplanted it. On the other hand, under Ridgeway's hypothesis, tragedy would not become "completely dignified" until the substitution of "melodramas" for satyric dramas became not only spasmodic or occasional but customary; and we have no reason to suppose that this ever happened even in the fourth century.

¹ Cf. Rabe, *Rhein. Mus.*, LXIII (1908), 150.

² Wilamowitz' conjecture for *Δράκων* of the MS.

³ Ad Hor. *Epist.* ii. 3. 276.

⁴ Cf. Plut. *Solon* xxix and Diogenes Laert. i. 59.

award the place of honor to another.¹ The question immediately arises as to exactly what language Solon employed; the words τῆς τραγῳδίας πρῶτον δρᾶμα are, of course, only a paraphrase, for no form of the word τραγῳδία could be used in elegiac verse. This objection does not lie against the word δρᾶμα, however, and it will be remembered that the Dorians based their claims to tragedy partly upon this non-Attic term.² Thus, we obtain an explanation of the cumbersome circumlocution τῆς τραγῳδίας δρᾶμα. In Solon, Joannes (or his source) found only the ambiguous term δρᾶμα;³ a desire to retain the terminology of the original prevented his frankly substituting τραγῳδία. Accordingly, he kept δρᾶμα but inserted the defining genitive τῆς τραγῳδίας. This explanation is more probable than to suppose that Solon wrote τραγικὸν δρᾶμα, which is also possible metrically but fails to account for Joannes' circumlocution and is less probable on other grounds (cf. p. 269, below). I do not understand that Aristotle either indorses or rejects the Dorian pretensions with regard to this word, but in view of our present evidence I am of the opinion that Arion called his performances "dramas" and was the first to use the word in this sense and that there is so much of justice in the Dorian claims.

At the very least, Joannes' words prove that the tradition of Arion's connection with tragedy is as early as the first half of the sixth century. They are also in accord with Aristotle's phrase ἀπὸ τῶν ἐξαρχόντων τὸν διθύραμβον, for Herodotus (i. 23) characterizes Arion as follows: Ἀρίονα τὸν Μηθυμναῖον . . . διθύραμβον πρῶτον ἀνθρώπων τῶν ἡμεῖς ἴδμεν ποιήσαντά τε καὶ ὀνομάσαντα

¹ These considerations answer Nilsson's objections, *Neue Jahrbücher f. kl. Altertum*, XXVII (1911), 611, n.: "Was hat Solon in den ersten Jahrzehnten des VI. Jahrh. über die Tragödie sagen können, da Thespis, der Begründer der Tragödie nach einer Überlieferung, die nun einmal wohl urkundlich ist, erst lange Jahre nach dem Tod Solons bei dem ersten Agon in der Stadt siegte? . . . Solon wird sich für die Urgeschichte der Tragödie noch nicht interessiert haben." Cf. also Wilamowitz, *ibid.*, XXIX (1912), 470: "Die Anführung des Buchtitels garantiert noch besonders die Zuverlässigkeit des Zitates."

² Cf. *Poetics* 1448b1: καὶ τὸ ποιεῖν αὐτοὶ [sc. οἱ Δωριεῖς] μὲν δρᾶν, Ἀθηναῖους δὲ πρῶττεν προσαγορεύειν. In referring to this passage, Wilamowitz, *op. cit.*, p. 467, n. 3, says: "So viel wahr ist, dass δρᾶμα in der Tat ein Fremdwort ist; man redet im Kultus nur von δρώμενα."

³ I cannot accept Richards' dictum (cf. *Class. Rev.*, XIV, 388 ff.) that the word δρᾶμα cannot be used of comedy in Attic Greek, but in any case Joannes could not be expected to observe such distinctions.

καὶ διδάξαντα ἐν Κορίνθῳ. It is customary nowadays to seek to explain such notices as arising from the rival claims of jealous cities; but be it noted that here are two Attic sympathizers, Solon and Herodotus, granting full recognition to the literary achievements of a neighboring city. In fact, Herodotus is apparently too generous, for Arion could not have been the inventor of the dithyramb, broadly speaking. In an extant fragment Archilochus, who must have antedated Arion by half a century, declared:

ὥς Διωνύσοι' ἀνακτος καλὸν ἐξάρξαι μέλος
οἶδα διθύραμβον, οἶψυ συγκεραυνωθείς φρένας (Fr. 77, Bergk³).

But this must be interpreted in the light of Aristotle's full statement: γενομένη οὖν ἀπ' ἀρχῆς αὐτοσχεδιαστικῆς καὶ αὐτῇ [sc. τραγωδία] καὶ ἡ κωμῳδία, καὶ ἡ μὲν ἀπὸ τῶν ἐξαρχόντων τὸν διθύραμβον ἡ δὲ κτλ. (*Poetics* 1449a9 ff.), and it should be observed that Archilochus does not say that he knows how to write a dithyramb but how to take part in one as a drunken ἐξάρχων. Such a performance was doubtless largely improvisation, perhaps coupled with the rendition of some ritual chant (καλὸν μέλος). Διθύραμβος in this sense lived on side by side with the more developed meaning, being found (for example) in the fragment attributed to Epicharmus:

οὐκ ἔστι διθύραμβος ὅκχ' ὕδωρ πίης (Kaibel, *Com. Gr. Frag.*, p. 115).

Now Pindar (*Ol.* xiii. 19) called Arion's dithyramb "ox-driving" (βοηλάτης), and this epithet is most plausibly explained by reference to the practice of an Arcadian community, the Cynaethaens, of whom Pausanias speaks as follows: "What is most worthy of note is that there is a sanctuary of Dionysus here, and that they hold a festival in winter, at which men, their bodies greased with oil, pick out a bull from a herd . . . lift it up, and carry it to the sanctuary. Such is their mode of sacrifice" (viii. 19. 1, Frazer).¹ Arion must have taken such rude beginnings and developed them into a literary composition—ἐξέφανε χάριτες (Pindar, *loc. cit.*). Now Herodotus' words are capable of meaning just this, for ποιεῖν denotes not only "to compose" but also "to poetize."² In regard to *ὀνομάσαντα*

¹ Cf. Crusius, Pauly-Wissowa, V, 1206, and Kern, *ibid.*, 1041, who anticipated Ridgeway, *Origin of Tragedy*, p. 6, in this explanation.

² This distinction is so trite as scarcely to be deserving of comment, had it not recently escaped Professor Ridgeway's attention (*Class. Rev.*, XXVI [1912], 135).

I agree with those who think that in Herodotus' opinion Arion was the first to give names (titles) to his performances.¹

Herodotus' statements are repeated and amplified by Suidas *s.v.* Arion: λέγεται καὶ τραγικοῦ τρόπου εὐρετῆς γενέσθαι καὶ πρῶτος χορὸν στήσαι <κύκλιον> καὶ διθύραμβον ᾄσαι καὶ ὀνομάσαι τὸ ἀδόμενον ὑπὸ τοῦ χοροῦ καὶ σατύρους εἰσενεγκεῖν ἔμμετρα λέγοντας.² All this is merely a rephrasing of Herodotus, except the last four words. In these the emphatic word is ἔμμετρα, for in the Peloponnesus the dithyrambic choreutae must usually (*pace* Ridgeway) have been thought of as satyrs, and their improvisations³ must always have engaged the speaking as well as the singing voice. The use of meter marked the coming of artistic finish and the passing of a performance largely extemporaneous. Some idea of the technique of Arion's productions may be derived from *Bacchylides* xvii, a dithyramb in dialogue form and doubtless influenced somewhat by mature tragedy. The chorus of Athenians, addressing Aegeus (*βασιλεῦ τῶν ἱερῶν Ἀθανᾶν*), inquires why a call to arms has been sounded (vss. 1-15), and the coryphaeus replies that a herald has just arrived, and summarizes his account (vss. 16-30). The chorus asks for further details (vss. 31-45), and once more the king's reply is borrowed from the herald (vss. 46-60). Such a treatment exemplifies the original function of the "answerer."⁴ Here the coryphaeus is given a dramatic character, that of Aegeus, but this was doubtless a later development; even so, Aegeus says practically nothing for himself but merely reports a herald's observations.

¹ Cf. Haigh, *Tragic Drama*, p. 17, n. 1, and Pickard-Cambridge, *Class. Rev.*, XXVI (1912), 54. Is it possible that *ὀνομάσαντα* refers to Arion's employing a new generic term (*δράματα*) for his dithyrambs? Herodotus may have taken it as a matter of course that everyone knew what this new name was and consequently failed to mention it, thus leaving the passage ambiguous.

² I cannot agree with Reisch, *Festschrift Gomperz*, p. 471, and Pickard-Cambridge, *Class. Rev.*, XXVI (1912), 54, in thinking that this notice refers to three separate types of performance, not one.

³ These did not involve *μίμησις*, since they would not say what was appropriate to satyrs but to themselves in *propria persona* as revelers and worshipers.

⁴ Cf. Pollux iv. 123; ἐλεὺς δ' ἦν τράπεζα ἀρχαία, ἐφ' ἣν πρὸ Θέσπιδος εἰς τις ἀναβὰς τοῖς χορευταῖς ἀπεκρίνατο. The first part of this notice is probably due to a false inference from a scene in some comedy, cf. Hiller, *Rh. Mus.*, XXXIX (1884), 329, and *Athen.* I. 21F: παρὰ δὲ τοῖς κωμικοῖς ἡ περὶ τῶν τραγικῶν ἀπὸκριται πύστις.

In the Hermogenes commentary Wilamowitz finds "die Bestätigung dass die *τραγωδοί* vor Thespis bestanden."¹ This development could scarcely have taken place at Corinth in Arion's time, for there was no need of coining a new word to designate the performers, so long as they consisted of *σάτυροι*. And if a term had then been derived from the choreutae to designate their performance it must have been **σατυρῳδία* and not *τραγωδία*. Neither could the new term have been derived at this period from the *prize*, for then the goat was only the third award.² Let us therefore turn to Sicyon.

But first it will be necessary to pause for a digression concerning the meaning of the words *τραγωδοί* and *τραγωδία*. Most authorities, both ancient and modern, have agreed that these terms were derived from *τράγος* ("goat") and *ὥδή* ("song"), but the explanation of this etymology is mooted. It will be best to catalogue the different theories.

1. A goat was the prize in the tragic contests. This view had great vogue in antiquity,³ and concerning it Bentley wrote: "All the other derivations of the word 'tragedy' are to be slighted and exploded."⁴

2. K. O. Müller considered that the eponymous goat was offered in sacrifice.⁵ This view will not appear necessarily inconsistent with

¹ *Neue Jahrbücher f. kl. Altertum*, XXIX (1912), 470.

² Cf. schol. Plato *Rep.* 394C: εὐρεθῆναι μὲν τὸν διθύραμβον ἐν Κορίνθῳ ὑπὸ Ἀρίωνος φασί. τῶν δὲ ποιητῶν τῷ μὲν πρώτῳ βοῦς ἑπαθλον ἦν, τῷ δὲ δευτέρῳ ἀμφορεύς, τῷ δὲ τρίτῳ τράγος, ὃν τρυγί κεχρισμένον ἀπήγον. This notice is too circumstantial to be merely an aetiological explanation of *βοηλάτης*.

³ Cf. *Marmor Parium*, ep. 43; *Anthol. Pal.*, VII, 410 (Dioscorides); Eratosthenes, *Erigona* (=Hyginus *Astron.* ii. 4 and Maass, *Analecta Eratosthenica* [= *Philol. Untersuch.*, herausg. von Kiessling u. Wilamowitz, VI], p. 113); Eusebius and Jerome s. *Ol.* 47. 2; Diomedes *Gram.* iii. 487K; Hor. *Epist.* ii. 3. 220; Porphyryon, Acro, and pseudo-Acro, *ad loc.*; Philargyrius and Probus *ad Verg. Georg.* ii. 382; schol. Plato *Rep.* 394C; *Etym. Magn.*, p. 764, 2; schol. in Dionys. Thrac., p. 747 b; Evanthius, *De Comoedia* (Wessner, I, 13); Joannes Diaconus, *Comm. in Hermog. (Rhein. Mus., LXIII, 150, ll. 21 ff.)*; and Tzetzes, *Prol. ad Lycoph.*, I, p. 254, 15M. These references, of course, do not furnish cumulative evidence, and are merely the outcropping of the same tradition. But at any rate they possess the merit of carrying this tradition back almost without interruption until at least the third century B.C. In this respect no other tradition can be compared with it.

⁴ Cf. *Dissertation upon Phalaris*, p. 295; a similar sentiment likewise on p. 292.

⁵ *Hist. of Lit. in Anc. Greece*, I, 385, Eng. ed. Cf. also Diomedes *Gram.* iii. 487K, and Plut. *De cup. divit.*, p. 527D.

No. 1, if we remember that in the later dithyrambic contests the prize (a tripod) was not regarded as a personal possession of the victor, but was customarily consecrated in some temple or other public place. Cf. also the story in Herod. i. 144.

3. The Latin grammarians seem to have evolved the theory that the prize was a goat-stomach sack filled with wine.¹

4. The satyric choreutae resembled and were called "goats."² This explanation was accepted by Welcker, *Nachtrag zu d. Schrift über d. Aesch. Tril. nebst einer Abh. über d. Satyrspiel* (1826), p. 240, and has met with favorable consideration from most later authorities (cf. especially Wilamowitz, *Einleitung in d. gr. Tragödie* [= Heracles' vol. 1], pp. 81 ff., and Wernicke, *Hermes*, XXXII [1897], 290 ff.).

5. The early choreutae danced in honor of a goat-god, Διόνυσος Μελάναιγος (cf. Reisch, *Festschrift Gomperz*, p. 468; Farnell, *Jour. Hellenic Stud.*, XXIX [1909], p. xlvii, and *Cults of the Gr. States*, V, 234 ff.; and Nilsson, *Neue Jahrbücher f. kl. Altertum*, XXVII [1911], 685-90). Schmid suggests the equation τραγφῶδς = ὁ τὸν τράγον ᾄδων (cf. Christ-Schmid, *Griech. Literaturgesch.*, I, 260, n. 2). This theory ignores the fact that tragedy and its choreutae antedated 535 B.C. But its connection with Dionysus Eleuthereus (Μελάναιγος) did not. Is there any reason to suppose that Dionysus of Icaria, Sicyon, or Corinth was τραγοειδής?

6. The choreutae were called (and assumed the appearance of) τράγοι, just as devotees were called ἵπποι, ἄρκοι, ταῦροι, etc., in various other cults (cf. Reisch, *op. cit.*, p. 468, and Nilsson, *op. cit.*, pp. 688-90).

7. Wilhelm Schmid, *Zur Geschichte d. gr. Dithyrambus* (1901), p. 12, n. 2, and p. 19, n. 2, suggests that the early performers were *Hirten* dressed in the usual rural costume (a διφθέρα) and consequently humorously dubbed τράγοι.

8. Ridgeway, *op. cit.*, p. 91, points out that goat skins were the ordinary costume in primitive Greece and supposes that by religious conservatism they were retained in these performances until they assumed a sacred significance.

¹ Cf. Evanthius, *De Comoedia* (Wessner, I, p. 13).

² The ancient authorities will be quoted, pp. 280 f., below. Is not Ridgeway, *Origin of Tragedy*, p. 72, mistaken in attributing this view to Bentley?

Several abortive attempts have recently been made to abandon the *τράγος* = goat etymology. Thus, (9) Miss Jane Harrison, *Class. Rev.*, XVI (1902), 331, and *Prolegomena to the Study of Greek Religion*, pp. 416, 421 ff. (1903), proposed that *τραγῳδία* = "speltsong," but has now withdrawn the suggestion (cf. her *Themis* [1912], p. xxxi).

10. Professor Margoliouth in his edition of the *Poetics*, pp. 61 ff., derives it from *τραγίζειν*, "to be cracked," used of the voice at puberty. *Τραγῳδία* would then be a "song of irregular pitch."

11. L. H. Gray, *Class. Quarterly*, VI (1912), 62 f., would derive it from an Indo-Germanic base **tereg*, of which *τράγο-* would be the second "full grade" but for which he can cite no other derivatives in Greek, meaning "mighty" or "terrible." In that case, *τραγῳδία* would be the "singing of bold [or terrible] things" in contradistinction to *κωμῳδία* the "singing of revelrous things."¹

Of these explanations No. 4 has now held the field almost without challenge for nearly a century. Yet the evidence for it, which will be considered in detail on pp. 278 ff., below, was never really strong and in recent years has slowly crumbled away, as different parts of it have been critically studied. This fact is partly responsible for the appearance of so many new explanations within the last decade. Of these it may be said at once that none of them rests upon adequate foundations and that some of them are demonstrably false. We are therefore brought back to No. 1—or its variant, No. 2—which in my opinion has been most unjustly abandoned in modern times, and I think a reaction in their favor has already begun. They are spoken of respectfully by Reisch, *Festschrift Gomperz*, pp. 467 f; and Pickard-Cambridge, *Class. Rev.*, XXVI (1912), 59, mentions them exclusively. Of course, the line from Eratosthenes' *Erigona*, *Ἰκάριοι τόθι πρῶτα περὶ τράγον ὠρχήσαντο* is frankly aetiological, but it presupposes a belief in the goat prize of early tragedy, to account for which it was invented. Is the goat prize itself a mere aetiological invention? Certainly nothing could be more staid than the Parian Marble's entry: ἀφ' οὗ Θέσπις ὁ ποιητὴς [ὑπεκρίνα]το πρῶτος, δς

¹ Later authorities among the ancients also proposed fantastic derivations from *τράξ*; cf. Diomedes *Gram.* iii. 487K; Joannes Diaconus, *op. cit.*, ll. 9–20; Tzetzes, *op. cit.*, p. 254, 15M; *Etymol. Magn.*, p. 764, 3; and Evanthius, *De Comoedia* (Wessner, I, p. 13); *τραχία*, cf. schol. in Dionys. Thrac., p. 747 b, and Tzetzes, *op. cit.*, p. 254, 18M; and *τερπάγωρος*; cf. *ibid.*, p. 254, 17M and *Etymol. Magn.*, p. 764, 4.

ἔδιδαξε [δρ]ᾶ[μα ἐν ᾗ]στ[εῖ καὶ ἄθλον ἐ]τέθη ὁ [τ]ράγος, κτλ., every other detail of which is unquestioned. The anonymous author of the marble consulted the best of authorities, so that also this notice must go back to the fourth century at least and may not be branded as irresponsible.¹ What was the banquet to which the priest of Dionysus used to invite the victorious poet, actors, etc., (cf. Tucker ad Arist. *Ranas* 297), but a survival from the time when the victor sacrificed his prize and feasted his associates? This form of prize was for some reason abandoned, probably at the end of the sixth century, when the festival arrangements seem to have undergone several modifications; and this fact explains the absence of literary allusions to the custom during the next century. It should also be observed that we possess no fifth-century evidence for the tripod prize, the historicity of which is beyond dispute.

After this digression, we may return to a consideration of early performances at Sicyon. In a well-known passage (v. 67) Herodotus tells us how the Sicyonians honored their former king, Adrastus, both in other ways and τὰ πάθεα αὐτοῦ τραγικοῖσι χοροῖσι ἐγέραιρον, and how their tyrant Clisthenes in anger at Adrastus χοροὺς μὲν τῷ Διονύσῳ ἀπέδωκε, τὴν δὲ ἄλλην θυσίην Μελανίππῳ (whose bones Clisthenes had brought over from Thebes and who had killed Adrastus' brother and son-in-law). In this passage the meaning of the word τραγικοῖσι has provoked much discussion. Perhaps the most common view is that Herodotus employed a term of his own day retrospectively, i.e., "at an early date in the sixth century there were solemn choruses in honour of Adrastus at Sicyon, which, so far as Herodotus (over a century later) could judge, were sufficiently like the choruses in the tragedies of his contemporaries to be called 'tragic.'"² Though this interpretation is certainly possible, I do not deem it correct. It is my opinion that Herodotus called these choruses τραγικοί because the Sicyonians themselves called them

¹ Cf. Reisch, *op. cit.*, p. 468: "An der Thatsache, dass in älterer Zeit dem Tragödenchor ein Bock als Preis (der als Opferthier und Opferschmaus dienen sollte), gegeben wurde, wie dem Dithyrambenchor zu gleichem Zwecke ein Stier, daran zu zweifeln ist kein Grund."

² Pickard-Cambridge, *Class. Rev.*, XXVI (1912), 55. This was also Bentley's view (cf. *Dissert. upon Phalaris*, p. 293). But Bentley had an ax to grind.

that. It is therefore immaterial, for our present purpose, what meaning he gave to the word, or whether he understood by it the same thing as the Sicyonians did or not. In fact it is quite possible that in his day even the Sicyonians used the word in a secondary sense. But the fact remains that *originally* their choruses were "goat" choruses, and it is our object to inquire why this came about.

The transfer of the Sicyonian dances from Adrastus to Dionysus would probably happen early in the reign of Clisthenes (*circa* 595-60). Now for this very period Eusebius (*Ol.* 47. 2 = 591/0 B.C.; Armen. version, *Ol.* 48. 1) preserves the following notice: τοῖς ἀγωνιζομένοις παρ' Ἑλλήσι τράγος ἐδίδοτο, ἀφ' οὗ καὶ τραγικοὶ ἐκλήθησαν (Jerome: "his temporibus certantibus in agone (de voce *add.* R) tragus, id est hircus, in praemio dabatur. Unde aiunt tragoedus nuncupatos"). Furthermore, some regarded Epigenes of Sicyon as the first of fifteen tragic poets before Thespis; cf. Suidas *s.v.* Thespis: Θέσπης τραγικὸς ἑκαδέκατος ἀπὸ τοῦ πρώτου γενομένου τραγωδιοποιῶν Ἐπιγένην τοῦ Σικωνίου τιθέμενος· ὥς δέ τινες, δεύτερος μετὰ Ἐπιγένην· ἄλλοι δὲ αὐτὸν πρῶτον τραγικὸν γενέσθαι φασί. It is therefore only natural to suppose that Herodotus, Eusebius (Jerome), and Suidas all refer to the same event, and that Clisthenes employed Epigenes to initiate his innovation. The neatness with which these notices fit together to produce this result renders them comparatively secure from the critical assault which might more successfully be directed against them individually. In any case, it is incumbent upon any skeptic, not merely to reject the later authorities, but also to provide a more satisfactory explanation of Herodotus. But there still remains another bit of testimony which ought to be considered in connection with the foregoing. Several explanations are preserved of the proverb οὐδὲν πρὸς τὸν Διόνυσον.¹ These are somewhat vague in details and need not be taken too seriously; but at least they are valuable as showing the general periods in which their authors thought that the proper situation for the rise of such a proverb existed. One of these explanations concerns us here (cf. Suidas *s.v.*): Ἐπιγένην τοῦ Σικωνίου τραγωδίαν εἰς τὸν Διόνυσον ποιήσαντος, ἐπεφώνησάν τινες τοῦτο· ὅθεν ἡ παροιμία. In just what

¹ Cf. Plut. *Symp.* 615A; Suidas *s.v.* (=Photius *s.v.* and Apostolius xiii. 42); pseudo-Diogenianus vii. 18; and Zenobius v. 40.

particular Epigenes' performance seemed alien to the worship of Dionysus, Suidas does not indicate. Ridgeway, *Origin of Tragedy*, p. 58, supposes that Epigenes "did not confine himself to Dionysiac subjects." But surely that development came much later. In my opinion, the explanation is simpler. We have no information as to the costume which the choreutae wore in honoring the sorrows of Adrastus. There was, of course, no reason for their appearing as satyrs. But were satyric choreutae introduced at the same time that the dances were given over to Dionysus? If we answer this question in the negative, the situation becomes clear. The audience, or part of it, was sufficiently acquainted with the performances instituted by Arion at Corinth to expect a chorus of satyrs in the Sicyonian dances after they were transferred to Dionysus; and when Epigenes brought on his choreutae in the same (non-satyric) costume as had previously been employed, they naturally manifested their surprise with the ejaculation: οὐδὲν πρὸς τὸν Διόνυσον. By this they meant: "Why, these χορευταί are just what we have had all the time; there is nothing of the σάτυροι about them. They have nothing to do with Dionysus!"

If this series of conclusions is accepted, we have an answer to the question under consideration—the occasion of the term τραγῳδοί. We must conclude that honoring Adrastus with choruses either did not involve the giving of a prize or that the prize was other than a goat. With the introduction of Dionysus, a goat, for some reason, was chosen as the object of competition (and was doubtless immediately consumed in a sacrificial feast). We have seen (p. 269, above) that at Corinth, where the choreutae were satyrs, there was no reason to coin a new term to designate them. But at Sicyon the situation was different. What more natural than that from the new prize should be derived new names (τραγικοὶ χοροί and τραγῳδοί respectively) for the new-old performances and their choreutae.¹

¹ This interpretation still involves an anachronism (a negligible one) in Herodotus, inasmuch as he has assigned to the choruses in honor of Adrastus an adjective which came into use only after they were transferred to Dionysus. Of course, it is possible to argue that goats may have been sacrificed to Adrastus and that τραγικός and τραγῳδός were consequently older terms than is maintained in the text; this would also explain why the goat was continued as a prize after the sacrifice proper was given over to Melanippus. Cf., however, Farnell, *Cults of the Greek States*, V, 233 and note d.

It is not enough to pass this tradition of Sicyonian tragedy by in silence or to brand it as aetiological or as arising from the partisanship of rival cities. It must first be shown either to be inconsistent with itself or with other established facts.

Though the sort of performances from which tragedy developed existed in Attica from time immemorial,¹ yet they did not emerge into prominence or literary importance until the time of Thespis and in Icaria. Evidently Thespis' innovations were partly borrowed from the Peloponnesus and partly his own. Included among the former would be the use of meter, the goat prize, and such terms as *δρᾶμα* and *τραγωδός*. Most distinctive among the latter was his invention of the first actor. To this it would be unnecessary to devote more than a passing reference, had not Ridgeway recently called the matter into question. The innovation is expressly attributed to Thespis only by Diogenes Laertius iii. 56: *ἐν τῇ τραγωδίᾳ πρότερον μὲν μόνος ὁ χορὸς διεδραμάτιζεν, ὕστερον δὲ Θεσπὶς ἓνα ὑποκριτὴν ἐξεύρεν ὑπὲρ τοῦ διαναπαύεσθαι τὸν χορὸν*, though it may be inferred in several other connections. But in Ridgeway's opinion, *Origin of Tragedy*, p. 60, "this cannot mean, as is commonly held, that Thespis first separated in some degree the coryphaeus from the chorus and made him interrupt the dithyramb with epic recitations," for *πρὸ Θεσπίδος (μήπω τάξιν λαβούσης τραγωδίας, Etym. Magn., s.v. θυμολη) εἰς τις ἀναβὰς [sc. ἐπὶ τράπεζαν] τοῖς χορευταῖς ἀπεκρίνατο* (Pollux iv. 123). These late notices are manifestly vague and inexact references to rudimentary histrionicism among the choreutae themselves or between them and their coryphaeus (cf. p. 268 and n. 4, above). Evidently the matter is largely one of definition. Ridgeway himself concedes all that is important, when he says: "There seems no reason to doubt that Thespis in some way defined more exactly the position of the actor, especially by the introduction of a simple form of mask" (*op. cit.*, p. 60).

Ridgeway considers that Thespis made the "grand step" in the evolution of tragedy when he

detached his chorus and dithyramb from some particular shrine, probably at Icaria his native place, and taking his company with him on waggons gave

¹ Cf. Plato, *Ménos* 321A: *ἡ δὲ τραγωδία ἐστὶν παλαιὸν ἐνθάδε, οὐχ ὡς οἴονται ἀπὸ Θεσπίδος ἀρξαμένη οὐδ' ἀπὸ Φρυγίχου, ἀλλ' εἰ θέλεις ἐννοῆσαι, πᾶν παλαιὸν αὐτὸ εὐρήσεις ὃν τῆσδε τῆς πόλεως εἶρημα.*

his performances on his extemporised stage when and where he could find an audience, not for religious purposes but for a pastime. Thus not merely by defining more accurately the rôle of the actor but also by lifting tragedy from being a mere piece of religious ritual tied to a particular spot into a great form of literature, he was the true founder of the tragic art. This view offers a reasonable explanation of Solon's anger on first seeing Thespis act. A performance which he would have regarded as fit and proper when enacted in some shrine of the gods or at a hero's tomb, not unnaturally roused his indignation when the exhibition was merely "for sport," as Thespis himself said (and doubtless also for profit), and not at some hallowed spot, but in any profane place where an audience might conveniently be collected (*op. cit.*, p. 61).

For all this there is not only not a single shred of evidence, but it is highly improbable as well. It is true that after long neglect Thespis' *plaustrum* (Hor. *Epist.* ii. 3. 276) seems to be enjoying a recrudescence of favor. Dieterich¹ and Wilamowitz² refer to it in all seriousness. There is nothing improbable about the tradition nor any cogent reason for supposing it borrowed from the history of early comedy. It is natural to suppose that Thespis did not restrict his activities to Icaria but extended them to such other demes as were interested or found them appropriate for their festivals. In that case, means of transportation for performers and accessories became imperative. The use of such a vehicle in the *Prometheus* shows that it need not necessarily have served also as a stage, as has sometimes been thought. But to suppose that Thespis entirely dissociated his performances from shrines and festivals not only rests upon no evidence, as I have said, but is too revolutionary to be credible.

I am also inclined to think that the innovation of treating non-Dionysiac themes was also due to Thespis, but the suspicion³ thrown upon the extant titles attributed to him renders the point incapable of proof. It is unnecessary to enlarge upon the recognition given to tragedy at the city Dionysia in 534 B.C., except to protest against a not uncommon tendency to assume that terms like *τραγῳδός* and *τραγῳδία* were not in use before this date. Of course, the matter cannot be definitely proven, but the developments which I have been tracing at Sicyon and Icaria distinctly favor the other view.

¹ Cf. *Kleine Schriften*, p. 422.

² Cf. *Neue Jahrbücher f. kl. Altertum*, XXIX (1912), 474.

³ Cf. Diogenes Laert. v. 92.

We have seen that (p. 264, above) according to a natural and plausible interpretation of Aristotle *all* the early Attic performances were "satyric," though *none* of them was called a "satyric drama," and that (p. 274) non-satyric τραγῳδοί were the choreutae of Sicyonian performances early in the sixth century. Presently (p. 282, below) we shall find reasons for believing that the early Attic choreutae were not satyrs but silenoi. What, then, was the origin of the performance which in the fifth century constituted the final member of tetralogies? Such tetralogies cannot be made out for any playwright before Aeschylus; and the number of plays attributed to Pratinas, eighteen tragedies and thirty-two satyric dramas, throws additional doubt upon the probability that the early poets were required to present four plays together.¹ There is accordingly not a little in favor of Suidas' account of Pratinas of Phlius, which expressly states that he πρῶτος ἔγραψε σατύρους. The meaning of all this is quite clear. After tragedy had lost its exclusively Bacchic themes and had considerably departed from its original character, Pratinas introduced, from the same general region and literary genre as had provided the germ of tragedy, a new manner of performance which more closely resembled the pre-Thespian drama and which continued, at least for a while, the Bacchic subjects so appropriate to the god's festival. We must admit the probability, however, that the Peloponnesian dances had developed somewhat since the days of Arion and Epigenes and also that Pratinas borrowed something from the contemporaneous tragic performances at Athens.²

¹ In a letter Professor Capps suggests "that Pratinas may have done pretty often what he did in 467 (provide a satyr-play for somebody's else trilogy, cf. arg. Aesch. *Septem*). It may be that in this way we may account for the excessive number of tragedies in other poets' lists." The *Palaeatae* may also have been a repeated or a posthumous piece.

² That Pratinas was familiar with satyric performances at Phlius and did not get his knowledge of the subject merely after he came to Athens is the most natural implication from *Anthol. Pal.*, VII, 707; ἐκισσοφόρησε γὰρ ἀνὴρ (sc. Σωσίθεος) δέξια Φλιασίων, καὶ μὴ χοροῦς, Σατέρων (Dioscorides).

For the dual origin of tragedy and satyric drama cf. p. 263, n. 1, above; Reisch, *Festschrift Gomperz*, pp. 451 ff.; and Pickard-Cambridge, *Class. Rev.*, XXVI (1912), 53. Confirmation for the view that satyric drama was later than tragedy might be sought in Hor. *Epist.* ii. 3. 221 (cf. Acro, *ad. loc.*, and most editors). But in my opinion Horace refers merely to the transition from the third to the fourth play of a tetralogy. *Satyros* is a factitive accusative—"the poet stripped his <choreutae so as to represent> satyrs."

The series of conclusions adopted up to this point considerably lessens the importance of the much-mooted question relative to the caprine or equine appearance of satyrs in the sixth and fifth centuries. Notwithstanding, the recent emergence of one or two new bits of evidence will perhaps justify a summary, which will fall into three parts: (a) archaeological, (b) the extant dramas, and (c) other literary evidence.

a) Fortunately, the identity and appearance of silenoi¹ in Attica in the early sixth century are fixed by the inscription ΣΙΑΕΝΟΙ and the representation of three figures with equine tails, legs, and hoofs on the François vase.² On the other hand, toward the close of this century a Würzburg cylix³ shows an ithyphallic creature with equine tail, and underneath the inscription ΣΑΤΡΤΒΣ, a manifest mistake for σάτυρος. At first glance, this seems to substantiate the supposition that either term was applicable to such horse-men without distinction.⁴ But in my opinion this situation did not obtain, except for a short time and only in Attica, cf. p. 282, n. 2, below.

Further progress is blocked by two difficulties: (1) the absence of inscriptions prevents certainty in naming such equine and caprine creatures as appear upon fifth-century vases; this objection affects

Perhaps I ought to mention that Professor Murray has proposed another interpretation of Suidas' notice concerning Pratinas: "I take this to mean that Pratinas was the first person to *write words* for the rout of revelling masquers to learn by heart. Thespis, like many early Elizabethans, had been content with a general direction: 'Enter Satyrs, in revel, saying anything'" (incorporated in Miss Harrison's *Themis*, p. 344). Nevertheless, he adds that he "does not wish to combat" the other view.

¹ For first drawing the distinction clearly between the equine silenoi of Asia Minor, Northern Greece, and Attica and the caprine satyrs of the Peloponnesus we are indebted to Furtwängler, *Der Satyr aus Pergamon*, 40th Berl. Winckelm. Prog. (1880), pp. 22 ff.

² Cf. Baum., Fig. 1883. An enlarged detail is given in Miss Harrison's *Prolegomena to the Study of Gr. Rel.*, p. 376.

³ Cf. Ulrichs, *Verzeichniss d. Antikensammlung d. Univ. Würzburg*, I, 50, No. 87. The head is broken off; also part of the tail, but enough remains to show that it is equine. The feet are human. For two photographs of this figure I am indebted to the courtesy of Professor Heinrich Bulle, who also kindly expressed the following judgment with regard to the inscription: "Ich kann nicht mit Ch. Fränkel, *Satyr- und Bakchennamen* (Bonner Dissertation, 1912), S. 35, der Lesung von Schulz (*Göttinger Gel. Anz.*, 1896, S. 254) ΕΙΒΤΡΤΑΕ zustimmen; denn die Inschrift ist ja rechtsläufig. Man kann übrigens auch deutlich an dem Kleinerwerden der Buchstaben sehen, dass der Zeichner von links nach rechts geschrieben hat. Ich glaube mit Ulrichs, dass es eine einfache Verschreibung aus ΣΑΤΡΤΒΕ ist."

⁴ Cf. Miss Harrison, *op. cit.*, p. 389, and Reisch, *Festschrift Gomperz*, p. 459.

most of the material collected by Wernicke;¹ and (2) the lack of inscriptions would not matter, if we could be sure that certain scenes were derived from the satyric drama. But in most cases we cannot even be positive that they reflect any kind of theatrical performance at all. Thus, Duris' psykter (*Brit. Mus. Cat.*, III, E 768) and Brygus' cylix (*Baum. Supplementtafel*, Fig. 7), belonging to the first third of the fifth century, depict horse-men which Reisch, *op. cit.*, p. 459, claims represent at least the indirect influence of the satyric drama.² On the contrary, the Pandora vase of about 450 B.C. (*Jour. Hellenic Studies*, XI, Pl. XI) shows us creatures with goat hoofs, horns, and tails, and the flute-player would indicate some theatrical performance. But Reisch, *op. cit.*, pp. 456 f., rightly objects that there is no necessary connection between the frieze of goat-men and the Pandora scene, and that some such comedy as Eupolis' *Alves* might equally well have been the source of the design. In all these instances the only verdict possible is *non liquet*.

The only certain instance is afforded by a Naples vase of about 400 B.C. (*Baum.*, Fig. 422). These satyrs are without hoofs and horns, have horses' tails, and wear a sort of loin band which is supposed to be of goats' skin. It is customary to maintain that this goat skin is the sole survival of the original goatlike aspect of the dramatic satyrs, who were becoming more and more assimilated to the silenoi. For such a development no indisputable evidence has been cited. At least, there were no further developments subsequently (cf. *Baum.*, Fig. 424).³

b) From the extant dramas it has been usual to cite Eur. *Cyclops* 80: *σὺν τᾷδε τράγον χλαίνα μελέα*. Reisch, *op. cit.*, p. 458, n., supposes that this part of the satyrs' costume is due to their acting as herdsmen in this play, a suggestion to which Wilamowitz demurs.⁴ But in any case, the point is not very important.

¹ Cf. *Hermes*, XXXII (1897), 297 ff. Reisch, *op. cit.*, pp. 457 f., would call the goat-men Pans.

² The possibility of direct borrowing had already been denied by Wernicke, *op. cit.*, pp. 302-6.

³ Cf. Körte in Bethe's *Proleg. zur Gesch. d. Theaters im Alt.*, p. 343, n. 2; Haigh, *Greek Theatre*,³ p. 293, n.

⁴ Cf. *Neue Jahrbücher f. kl. Altertum*, XXIX (1912), 465 f. Wilamowitz assigns the words altogether too much importance. Cf. also Dion. Hal. vii. 72 (p. 1491): *σκευαί . . . τοῖς δ' εἰς Σατύρους <sc. εἰκασθεῖσι> περιζώματα καὶ δοραὶ τράγων κτλ.*

Proof of the caprine appearance of satyrs has been sought also in Aesch. fr. 207 (Nauck), from his satyric play entitled *Προμηθεὺς Πυρκαϊεύς*: *τράγος γένειον ἄρα πενθήσεις σύ γε*. But Professor Shorey has pointed out¹ that this passage exemplifies the common Greek idiom of omitting *ὥς* in comparisons, and should be translated: "[If you kiss that fire], you'll be the goat (in the proverb) who mourned (lost) his beard, you will," and consequently may not be cited upon the point here at issue. This interpretation, moreover, is strengthened by a similar simile (with *ὥς* expressed) in the new fragments of Sophocles' satyric drama, the *Ichneutae*.²

νίος γὰρ ὦν ἀνὴρ
πώγωνι θάλλων ὥς τράγος κνήκῃ χλιδᾷς.

Upon this passage Mr. Arthur Hunt, properly comments³ that it "does not imply that the person to whom it was applied was habited as a goat, though it might gain point if he were."

Furthermore, in the fragments of the satyric drama which Hunt⁴ and Paul Maas⁵ attribute to Sophocles, the chorus, being suitors for the hand of Oeneus' daughter and being asked for their qualifications, include "horse-racing" (*ἵππικῇ*).⁶ This bit of evidence finds support in the identity of nature between satyrs and silenoi implied in the fact that not only in Eur. *Cyclops* but also in Soph. *Ichneutae*⁷ the former are sons of the latter. By itself, of course, this fact has no great importance, but it at least helps to substantiate other bits of evidence.

c) The literary evidence largely depends upon the following notices: Aelian *V.H.* iii. 40: *οἱ συγχορευταὶ Διονύσου Σάτυροι ἦσαν, οἱ ἔν' ἐνίῳν Τίτυροι ὀνομαζόμενοι*; Hesych. *τίτυρος* · *σάτυρος*; *ibid.*: *τράγους* · *σατύρους* *διὰ τὸ τράγων ὄτα ἔχειν*; Eustath. *ad Il.* xviii. 495; *τίτυροι γὰρ Δωρικῶς οἱ σάτυροι*; schol. Theocr. vii. 72: *Τίτυρος*

¹ Cf. *Class. Phil.*, IV (1909), 433 ff., where the literature is cited.

² Cf. *Oxyrhynchus Papyri*, IX (1912), 59 [= *Trag. Gr. Frag. Papyracea Nuper Reperta* I, 1. 358].

³ Cf. *Ox. Papyri*, IX (1912), 34.

⁴ Cf. *Ox. Papyri*, VIII (1911), 61.

⁵ Cf. *Berl. Phil. Wochenschrift*, XXXII (1912), 1429.

⁶ *Trag. Gr. Frag. Papyr.*, VII, 1. 10.

⁷ Cf. *Cyclops* 13, 27, 36, 82, 269, 272, 431, and 587; and *Trag. Gr. Frag. Papyr.*, I, 147, 163, and 197.

. . . τινες δὲ παρὰ Δωριεῦσι τοὺς σατύρους ἀποδεδάκασι λέγεσθαι; *ibid.*, iii. 2: Τίτυρος κύριον ὄνομα, τινες δὲ φασιν ὅτι τις Σιληνός, οὗ Σικελιώτης· ἄλλοι δὲ τοὺς τράγους, ἕτεροι δὲ τοὺς Σατύρους (*cod. Ambros. 222*); τὸν Τίτυρον οἱ μὲν κύριον, οἱ δὲ Σάτυρον εἶναι φασι . . . τοὺς τράγους τιτούρους λέγουσι; *Servius ad Verg. Ecl. prooem.: Laconum lingua tityrus dicitur aries maior.* These passages manifestly relate to undramatic satyrs, especially in the Peloponnesus; there is nothing to indicate that they have any bearing upon the representation of satyrs in theatrical performances, certainly not in those at Athens.

On the other hand, *Etym. Magn.*, s.v.: τραγῳδία: ἡ ὅτι τὰ πολλὰ οἱ χοροὶ ἐκ σατύρων συνίσταντο, οὓς ἐκάλουν τράγους σκώπτοντες ἢ διὰ τὴν τοῦ σώματος δασύτητα ἢ διὰ τὴν περὶ τὰ ἀφροδίσια σπουδὴν· τοιοῦτον γὰρ τὸ ζῶον. ἢ ὅτι οἱ χορευταὶ τὰς κόμας ἀνέπλεκον, σχῆμα τράγων μιμούμενοι indisputably refers to the dramatic satyrs but does not prove all that is expected of it. It is customary to ignore or even omit the words between σκώπτοντες and ἀνέπλεκον. But it is necessary to interpret the phrase σχῆμα τράγων μιμούμενοι in terms of the details stated in the context. So far as we are now concerned, the only point of resemblance mentioned is their δασύτης. This and Horace's *nudavit . . . Satyros* would be entirely suitable in describing the satyrs on the Naples vase. No more is stated or implied, whereas the goat-men theory demands very much more than this. Furthermore, it will be noted that this interpretation occurs only in a late Byzantine authority and that no earlier source is mentioned. The only way in which a respectable antiquity can be claimed, by means of literary evidence, for this etymology consists in maintaining that it is implied in the theory that tragedy developed from satyric drama. But we have already seen (pp. 263 f., above) that Aristotle's phrase need not, and probably does not, support this view. The only other passage which can be cited in this connection occurs in three other Byzantine writers, Photius, Suidas, and Apostolius.¹

¹ Cf. s.v. οὐδὲν πρὸς τὸν Διόνυσον and *Apost.* xiii. 42: βέλτιον δὲ οὕτως, τὸ πρῶτον ἐπὶ τὸν Διόνυσον γράφοντες τοῖς ἡγωνίζοντο, ἅπερ καὶ Σατυρικά ἐλέγετο· ὕστερον δὲ μεταβάντες εἰς τὸ τραγῳδίας γράφειν, κατὰ μικρὸν εἰς μῦθους καὶ ἱστορίας ἐτράπησαν, μηκέτι τοῦ Διονύσου μνημονεύοντες, ὅθεν τοῦτο καὶ ἐπεφώνησαν. καὶ Χαμαιλέων ἐν τῷ Περὶ Θέσπιδος τὰ παραπλήσια ἱστορεῖ. The word παραπλήσια leaves it doubtful for how much of this notice Chamaeleon (Aristotle's pupil) should be held responsible. But at the most, his accountability cannot extend beyond explaining the introduction of non-Dionysiac themes; the side remarks are Byzantine.

The conclusion is irresistible that both the goat-men explanation of the word *τραγῳδία* and the supposed development of tragedy from satyric drama are due to "reconstructions" of literary history by Byzantine scholarship.

Eagerness to establish an explanation for the term *τραγῳδία* has prevented a dispassionate judgment upon the three groups of evidence just considered. The presence of satyrs at Corinth in the time of Arion or at Phlius in that of Pratinas does not justify us in supposing that satyrs were the attendants of Dionysus also in Thespian Icaria. In fact, these are much more likely to have been silenoi.¹ The choreutae were silenoi in Icaria, and silenoi they continued to be in Athens until such time as the choruses were no longer attendants of Dionysus. When Pratinas introduced the satyric drama, he naturally, for purposes of differentiation, had to introduce the Peloponnesian term as well; but in order to acclimatize his performance as far as possible, he transformed his satyrs so as to approximate the contemporaneous *τραγῳδοί*.² How exactly the Naples vase reproduces the type then adopted cannot now be determined, but in my opinion, there were few or no important changes in the representation of dramatic satyrs at Athens during the fifth century.

I need not enter upon a lengthy destructive criticism of recent theories of the origin of tragedy; that matter has received ample consideration from Wilamowitz.³ In conclusion, I wish merely to touch upon one phase of the subject—the value in this connection of present-day carnivals in Thessaly, Thrace, and Scyros. Most of the recent theories assume that these ceremonies are survivals of the primitive rites from which drama developed. A priori, the possibility that these carnivals should retain their essential features unchanged through two and a half millenniums amid all the vicissitudes which

¹ According to Attic tradition Dionysus and Silenus came to Athens together; cf. Paus. i. 23. 5: ἐπὶ τοῦτῳ [sc. a stone on the Athenian acropolis] λέγουσιν, ἦνικα Διόνυσος ἦλθεν ἐς τὴν γῆν, ἀναπαύσασθαι τὸν Σιληνόν.

² Such a development would naturally result in a certain ambiguity for a while in the popular use of these terms; cf. the passages cited by Reisch, *Festschrift Gomperz*, p. 455.

³ Cf. *Neue Jahrbücher f. kl. Altertum*, XXIX (1912), 471 ff.

have come upon these regions must be pronounced infinitesimal.¹ An examination of details confirms this impression. Certain ceremonies are parodies of the Christian rites of marriage and burial (Ridgeway, *Origin of Tragedy*, p. 19). Not only an Arab (*ibid.*, p. 22) but also a Frank (p. 24) appear in the cast of characters. Though Phrynichus was the first to represent female rôles,² such rôles abound in these modern plays (*ibid.*, pp. 17, 18, 22, and 24). But there is another feature still more serious: if there is one well-authenticated fact in the history of Greek drama, expressly stated by ancient tradition and fully substantiated by the extant plays, it is that tragedy arose from a choral performance and only gradually acquired its histrionic features. On the contrary, these carnivals are predominantly histrionic; there is either no chorus or its rôle is distinctly secondary. Had Aristotle been guilty of such a *faux pas*, we can easily imagine the derisive comments in which modern investigators would have indulged at his expense.

NORTHWESTERN UNIVERSITY

¹ Cf. Nilsson, *Neue Jahrbücher f. kl. Altertum*, XXVII (1911), 683, n. 1: "Da man sich allgemein scheut das Fortleben eines ursprünglich heidnischen Festes aus der antiken Zeit bis in die moderne anzunehmen," etc.

² Cf. Suidas, s.v. Phrynichus.

THE "CONTINUATION" OF THE ODYSSEY

By A. SHEWAN

A. THE LANGUAGE AND VERSE

On ψ 296 Dr. Monro notes, "the question whether the continuation [of the *Odyssey* from that line on] was needed in order to bring the story to a satisfactory close is one that can hardly be settled by discussion. The issue depends rather upon the evidence afforded by language and metre." Dr. Monro decides against the "Continuation." I venture here to give my reasons for believing that the evidence has been misappreciated on some points, and that, on others, that learned and greatly respected commentator was in conflict with scholars whose opinions are entitled to weight.

The length to which this paper will run must be my excuse for plunging *in medias res*, and leaving introductory matter to papers which will deal with other aspects of the question. Materials have been collected from (so far) some forty discussions, commencing (not to mention the Alexandrians) with Spohn in 1815-16, and ending with Belzner (*Komposn. der Od.*), 1912. It is a remarkable fact that the linguistic element, which to Dr. Monro was of such prime importance, has received the scantiest attention.

I will classify the phenomena under certain heads, and I begin with

1. *The ἀπαξ λεγόμενα*.—Time was when these were considered good serviceable ammunition in a Homeric encounter, but nowadays no critic of standing would rely on them unless they were of a very special character. For the "Continuation" Monro disregards them; they are neither striking nor more numerous than in other books. Friedländer gives them in his *Zwei Wörterverzeichnisse*, and they are set out by Spohn. More than half are massed in the third hundred lines of ω. One or two will have to be noticed below.

2. *Forms*.—ἐταρπήτην, ψ 430, a dual of a historical tense with the augment. Dr. Monro refers to *J. Phil.*, XXIII, 205: "the dual of the historic tenses is not as a rule augmented, and never by the poet of the *Odyssey*" (Platt). The proposition cannot stand. "There is nothing against the augmentation of duals as such"

(Mr. Drewitt in *C.Q.*, VI, 110). The dual had certainly no influence on the augment (Schmidt in *Philologus*, IX, 428). The grammarians give uncertain sounds.

I count 149 instances in the *Iliad* (Mr. Platt makes 151; I must have overlooked two) and 44 in the *Odyssey*. Of 18 of these (as ἡγησάσθην) we cannot say whether they are augmented or not; in 28 cases (ἄκουτε βάρην and the like) we cannot say what the original form was; in 28 the augmented form is impossible in the hexameter; and 16 are initial in the verse, and the augment was barred. Of the remainder 79 are unaugmented and 24 augmented, and of the latter many can *not* be amended away.

These duals are in similar case to the iteratives (*C.P.*, VII, 400 f.). Many were loaded with two long syllables (-ήτην, -εσθην) at the end, and there would be an objection to forms with a succession of long syllables, and to lengthening such words still further by the augment. The idea that these duals *could* not be augmented goes back to the Alexandrians, and it is possible enough that the augment has been omitted in some cases (μῦθον μυθείσθην, ἀρνύσθην, προσανδήτην and other compounds) in deference to the prejudice. And, if Mr. Platt is to be allowed to emend the augment away, we must be allowed to restore it where we can.

The prejudice was assisted by the fact of the smaller number of the duals in the *Odyssey*. It is assumed to be the later poem; and, just as it has been argued that the simile became "atrophied" (Mr. Drewitt in *C.Q.*, II, 107), so it has been contended that in decadent Odyssean days the dual had become a mere archaism. I believe this theory to belong to the large category of Homeric mare's nests. The paucity of the occurrences in the *Odyssey* can be explained much more simply. Grouping the instances in the *Iliad*, we find that 69 are due to the association of heroes in the fight (as Diomedes and Odysseus, 11, the Aiantes, 6), of heralds, competitors in the Games, etc.; 28 to gods acting in company (Hera and Athénē, 8, Hera and Hypnos, 4, Poseidon and Athénē, 3); and 22 to pairs of horses. These account for 119 out of 149. In the *Odyssey* there is not association of individuals in the same way; the gods do not act in pairs; horses give but four duals. So it is a question of subject-matter again; fewer duals are used because fewer are required. There is no degeneration.

The "Continuation," which ought to show the greatest aversion to, if not absolute avoidance of, the dual, has four to itself, or twice the average in the rest of the poem; and there is nothing against it or the *Odyssey* generally, in this matter.

ῥην, ψ 316 and ω 343; and also Λ 808 and τ 283, all four occurrences being of a type—ῥην the initial word, with a distinct pause after it. Dr. Monro remarks that the form is "clearly not Homeric," and cures Λ 808 by reading ῥεν, and τ 283 with ῥειν or εἶη. The latter he thinks probably right, but some think that optative (κεν εἶη = "would have been") inadmissible (*Lay of Dolon*, 241 ff.).

The form has been the subject of much controversy. The original Homeric forms are said to be ῥεν and εἶν (Monro, p. 464, quoting *K.Z.*, IX, 386). Schulze (*Q.E.*, 418) accepts ῥεν in all the three Odyssean passages, but at the heavy cost of an initial trochee. Cf. *H.G.*², 13 f., van Leeuwen, *Ench.*, 520, Curtius, *Verb* (Eng. tr.), 119, Brugmann, *Gr. Gram.*³, 274, and other participants in the discussion named by these. It may perhaps be accepted that ῥην is a false form—"a form in the bards' dialect due to false analogy" (Mangold, *De diectasi Homca.*, 178, approved by Rzach, *Der Dialekt des Hesiodus*, 456); so Kühner-Blass, II, 225, n. The authorities generally receive the form as of the vulgate, and do not attempt, by special treatment of some of the passages, to differentiate them from the others. The point of interest here is, what evidence ῥην is of the lateness of a passage in which it occurs. If it is only due to false analogy, it may still be quite ancient. It may have been in the text all the time, and it is mere slinging of mud to say it is not "Homeric," or "anomalous." *Irrationalität und Anomalie sind sehr precäre Begriffe* (Ludwich, *Ar.*, II, 264 ff.). *Prima facie* it is Homeric, and the burden of proving it is not can hardly be discharged till a legitimate origin for the form has been ascertained and dated. Had it been a form that continued to appear in later writers, the case would have been different. But it did not. Hesiod and others do not know it. Mr. Agar amends in ψ 314 and excises ω 343, and the reasons in each case are unusually good. But the fact of the family likeness in all four occurrences of ῥην gives one pause.

ζώννυνται, ω 88 f., ἥρων, ὅτε κέν ποτ' ἀποφθιμένου βασιλῆος
ζώννυνταί τε νέοι καὶ ἐπεντύνονται ἄεθλα. Curtius (*op. cit.*, 319)

accepts the form as a conjunctive, but that is "against all analogy" (Monro). But Faesi and others follow Curtius. Monro adds that *ζωννύονται* might be read with "violent synizesis" (though he compares *Ἐνναλίω*), the fact that the form cannot otherwise come into the hexameter being a partial excuse. Van Leeuwen holds that there is corruption in 88, and Merry suggests *ὄτε περ*—both taking the verbs as indicatives. Causer and Platt read *ζωννύνται* and *ἐντύνονται*. Hayman refers to *δαινῦτο* (opt.), Ω 665, and to the indicative after *ὅτ' ἄν* in κ 410 ff., where, however, *σκαίρωσι* may be read. No one suggests that a late date for the author is to be inferred from this word.

ξενίη, used as a substantive only ω 286 and 314. An objection of the *ἄπαξ λεγόμενον* kind. Monro (notes on ω 286 and ξ 389) thinks *ξενίη* (*ξενίη*, Schulze, *op. cit.*, 85) may be right. In the only other place where Homer requires to use the abstract noun, he uses *ξεινοσύνη* (φ 35), and Mr. Agar would read it, with a little manipulation, in both places in ω. It seems unnecessary. The adjective *ξένιος* occurs 6 times in the *Odyssey*.

δαί, ω 299. A doubtful form for Homer; perhaps in K 408, and in α 225, where it was Aristarchus' reading. In our passage *τοί* (comparing 308) and *δ' αὖ* have been proposed, and *δή* has some MS authority. Any of the four may be right.

ἐκείνος, ω 288, 312, 347, is said to be rare in Homer. It occurs 29 times, and in a number of cases it resists removal.

φιλίων, ω 268 (and τ 351), has strange treatment. It is said to have "crept into" τ from ω, "where it is doubtless one of the post-Homeric words" of that book. This is not argument. τ 351 may stand on its own legs; there is nothing against ω 268. Comparatives and superlatives which are ἄ. λλ. are not uncommon. Comparatives in *-ων* are even more common in Homer than in Attic (Seymour, *Language and Verse*, 59). Blass (*Interpol.*, 220) defends the form against Kirchhoff and Bekker.

3. *Meanings and uses.*—*ἡριγένεια* (without *ἥως*) = "the Dawn," ψ 347. "Not found in Homer." But see χ 197. It is hardly necessary to refer to the parallel cases of *ἐννοσίγαιος*, *ἐκάεργος*, *κελαδαινή*, etc.

φόβος, ω 57. "It is perhaps not a mere accident that this is the

only place in the *Odyssey* in which the word occurs" (φοβέω, π 163). It is enough to say that there is hardly a passage in the poems in which it can be said that the word has more indisputably what the critics would call its purely "Homeric" sense.

φάτις, ψ 362, "story about the Suitors." Usually the phrase means "the talk of men." The difference may be allowed—for what it is worth. The objections based on the various shades of the meaning of φῆμις are of the same kind and equally micrological.

ἡγεμόνευε, ω 155, "should mean 'led the way,' not merely 'went first (in time),' as it must do here." This is from Sittl, and again we might allow it, *quantum valeat*. But it seems pertinent to add that ἡγεμόνευε is here preceded by πρόσθε. The combination recurs in χ 400.

ἄλλος in ω 128, ἀλλὰ δόλον τόνδ' ἄλλον . . . μερμήριξε. Sittl again; he is a bad guide. His book, of which more in a later paper, is the worst of all books on the *Wiederholungen*. Following him, Monro seems to forget his own principles when he says, "ἄλλον has no clear meaning here, as no δόλος has been spoken of. In β 93"—same wording—"it refers to the preceding sentence, ὑπίσχεται ἀνδρὶ ἐκάστω." That is, in β 93, "she made promises to us all" precedes, and in our passage two lines, the first of which means "she shilly-shallied." Is this enough to quarrel about? But surely the critic forgets his own interpretation of ἄλλος elsewhere, as on ο 407, where he notes, "ἄλλη νοῦσος, 'disease as well,' according to the familiar idiom." Why not in our passage, "and devised the trick of the web *besides*"? We cannot bind Homer, in his much-maligned and much-misappreciated repetitions, to use every identical word and in the identical sense. Hayman, in his very helpful commentary, even renders "special."

αὐτοῦ, ω 241. "The use of the oblique cases of αὐτός where no emphasis is intended seems to be post-Homeric; cf. l. 80 and l. 282." It is not so stigmatized in *H.G.*², 219, and I do not think it necessary to quote the opinions of other grammarians. Certainly a very drastic expurgation of the poems will be necessary to get rid of all cases. The usage is a "moot point," as Mr. Agar says (*Homericæ*, 25; cf. 174, 218). He emends 12 cases in the first 12 books with what appears to be varying success. He follows Monro in our pas-

sage, and proposes τοῖδ' γε, which hardly seems to be an improvement. This use of αὐτός cannot, for the present, be considered evidence against a passage.

ἀδινάων (Σειρήνων), ψ 326. The epithet should, it is said, be understood of the voices of the Sirens (cf. κ 413, π 216, etc.), and is wrongly applied to the Sirens themselves. "The author *probably* had in his mind B 469, μυιάων ἀδινάων, and *may have* understood the word there of the ceaseless humming of the flies." The word occurs frequently, it has been much discussed, and it is admittedly difficult. One thing seems certain, that in the two Odyssean passages quoted above it means, in its adverbial form, *clara voce*. How then it cannot mean here "the Sirens of clear voice," it is not easy to see. φθόγγον points to that meaning. There is an exact parallel in the uses of λιγύς—κλαίειν λιγέως or λιγὺ πνείοντος, and λιγέων ἀνέμων and λιγὺς ἀγορητής. I will not add Μοῦσα λίγεια, as that is in ω 62.

ἐπιχειρέω occurs only ω 386 and 395. It is true, as remarked, that χεῖρας ἰάλλω is the phrase used elsewhere, though only twice outside the very common formula for attacking food.

So far, there is nothing serious in the usages impugned. There remain three in which affinity with later Greek is imputed.

εὖ ἔχει, ω 245, "the only instance of this phrase, afterwards so common"—that is, with the verb in the intransitive sense. The whole sentence is ἀλλ' εὖ τοι κομιδὴ ἔχει, and one need go no farther afield than to 244 (οὐκ ἀδαημονίη σ' ἔχει) and 249 (αὐτόν σ' οὐκ ἀγαθὴ κομιδὴ ἔχει), both common usages in Homer, for support to the view of Butcher and Lang that ὄρχατον, the last word preceding our clause, is to be supplied in it as object to ἔχει. It may also be suggested that the use of the *abstractum* κομιδὴ as subject of ἔχει in the intransitive sense would not be good. Monro has the support of other commentators, but their interpretation does not seem to be the best possible. One might suggest εὖ κομιδὴ ϝ' ἔχει.

ὑπάρξῃ, 286, "takes the first step," a use which is "distinctively Attic." "In Homer the simple ἄρχω sometimes has this sense," as B 378, ἐγὼ δ' ἄρχον χαλεπαίνων. But, if La Roche is correct (on ὑπό, p. 47) in accepting as probable Ameis' interpretation, *zuerst anfangen*, ὑπάρχω seems decidedly better here. ὑπό in

composition has some delicate shades of meaning. But the fact that the usage occurs only here remains.

πρῶϊ, ω 28, is said to mean "too early" or "prematurely." Its ordinary sense, in the phrase *πρῶϊ δ' ὑπηροῖσι* is "early," and one might so translate it in ω 28. So Butcher and Lang. The admittedly better vouched reading is *πρῶτα*, which Monro says would not give the meaning "too early." L. and S. say it would.

But, admitting that both *ὑπάρχω* and *πρῶϊ* are here used in later senses, and only here, of how many books in the poems can it be said that they do not contain instances of the kind? In A we have *ἐπευφημέω* and *ἐπαίτιος*, in Λ, *ρύσια*, *τί πάθω* and *τί παθόντε*. Most of the Homeric language persisted into later Greek, and one reads every day of one's life discussions in periodicals and commentaries in which Homer is referred back to as good authority for uses in Attic. That is to say, there are in Homer many usages which afterwards became "Atticisms." Is it reasonable to marvel at the fact that the Homeric text does not present frequent instances of every one of these?

4. *Syntax*.—ψ 345, of Athené, *ὅππότε δὴ ῥ' Ὀδυσῆα ἐέλπετο δν κατὰ θυμόν εὐνῆς ἧς ἀλόχου ταρπήμεναι*. *δν* is taken as referring to Odysseus, "not Athené as the place of the clause leads us to expect." Other editors, as Faesi, Düntzer, Hayman, and Ameis-Hentze, differ from Monro here. N 8 is a close parallel. And it is surely not good to take *δν κατὰ θυμόν* with *ταρπήμεναι*. But this alleged ambiguity, "and also the awkwardness of *δν κατὰ θυμόν* and *ἧς ἀλόχου*, in the same clause, indicate a non-Homeric authorship." That is too large an inference, even if awkwardness be admitted. But the very words *ἧς ἀλόχου* seem to make it impossible for a reader or hearer to feel any. The poet may surely trust to the context to some extent, as in Γ 386 ff., where we have *μιν* thrice and *οἱ* once in four lines; or σ 91-94, where *ἐπιφρασσάλατ' Ἀχαιοί* makes it clear that the third *μιν* has a new reference. The difficulty here is made out of flimsy materials.

ω 235-37, *μερμήριξε δ' ἔπειτα . . . κύσσαι καὶ περιφύναι ἐὼν πατέρ' ἠδὲ ἕκαστα εἰπεῖν, ὥς ἔλθοι καὶ ἴκοιτ' ἐς πατρίδα γαῖαν*. "The optative in *oratio obliqua* is a post-Homeric construction," and it has been pointed out that the first instance of it is in

Hym. Ven. 212-14. This is taking $\acute{\omega}\varsigma$ ="that." But $\acute{\epsilon}\kappa\alpha\sigma\tau\alpha$ is against that, and other editors differ. Indeed Monro himself, in *H.G.*², 281, translates, "to tell *how* he had come." The authorities distinguish the case from that in the Hymn, and Monro seems peculiar in his view. See Kühner-Gerth, I, 255; Gildersleeve's *Syntax of Class. Gk.*, 130; Goodwin's *M. and T.*, 261; Urtel, *Der Hom. Gebrauch des Optativs der abhängigen Rede*, 3; Brugmann, *op. cit.*, 508 f., and Mein, *De Optativi obliqui usu Homco.*, I, 22 f. *Frage- und Relativsätze* are separated from *Aussagesätze*, and reference is made to E 85, Φ 608 ff., η 14 ff., ι 89, 402, κ 101, 110, ν 415, \omicron 423, ρ 368 and 539 = σ 384 (the words of our passage, $\acute{\epsilon}\lambda\theta\omicron\iota \kappa\tau\lambda.$, after $\epsilon\iota$), and τ 463. These instances are after verbs of "inquiring"; ours is "telling how," but Gildersleeve even calls that an interrogative use, and Goodwin explains the development of the uses of $\acute{\omega}\varsigma$. And all the authorities differentiate our case from the later one in the Hymn. It may be added that it is possible enough that the optatives are due to ρ 359 = σ 384, and that we ought to read $\eta\lambda\theta\acute{\epsilon}\nu \tau\epsilon \kappa\alpha\iota \acute{\iota}\kappa\epsilon\tau\omicron \pi\alpha\tau\rho. \gamma.$, but there is no need to amend.

ω 340 ff. The optative, $\acute{\epsilon}\pi\iota\beta\rho\acute{\iota}\sigma\epsilon\iota\alpha\nu$, in 344 is said to be difficult owing to the intervention between it and the preceding past tenses of the clause with a present verb, $\acute{\epsilon}\nu\theta\alpha \delta' \acute{\alpha}\nu\alpha \sigma\tau\alpha\phi\upsilon\lambda\alpha\iota \pi\alpha\nu\tau\omicron\iota\alpha\iota \acute{\epsilon}\alpha\sigma\iota\nu$, in 343; and, if we regard this clause as parenthetical, the arrangement of clauses is deemed unsatisfactory. Mr. Agar, as already stated, excises the line, as one of a number inserted (in the view of many authorities) in the poems in order to supply a verb with an object or a subject, or vice versa—here $\acute{\eta}\eta\nu$ as a verb for $\acute{\epsilon}\kappa\alpha\sigma\tau\omicron\varsigma$ in 342. But other editors (as Faesi, Platt, Ameis-Hentze, and the Leyden editors) mark off the clause with dashes, and find no difficulty. And see Merry, *a.l.*, and Ameis-Hentze, *Anhang*. I had thought of $\acute{\epsilon}\eta\sigma\alpha\nu$ (which Homer does not happen to use), and see that Bekker had already made the conjecture. With $\acute{\alpha}\nu\alpha$ taken "distributively, 'in the different rows'" (Merry), $\acute{\epsilon}\pi\acute{\eta}\sigma\alpha\nu$ might do. The $\acute{\epsilon}\alpha\sigma\sigma\iota\nu$ and $\acute{\epsilon}\sigma\tau\alpha\sigma\alpha\nu$ of the MSS seem to point to corruption.

Enclitics are said to be misplaced in four lines of ω ,—247. $\acute{\omicron}\kappa \acute{\omicron}\gamma\chi\eta\eta, \acute{\omicron}\upsilon \pi\rho\alpha\sigma\iota\acute{\eta} \tau\omicron\iota \acute{\alpha}\nu\epsilon\upsilon \kappa\omicron\mu\acute{\iota}\delta\eta\varsigma$, 332. $\tau\acute{\eta}\nu \acute{\epsilon}\nu \Pi\alpha\rho\eta\eta\sigma\acute{\omega} \mu' \acute{\epsilon}\lambda\alpha\sigma\epsilon\nu \sigma\acute{\upsilon}\varsigma$, 335. $\delta\acute{\omega}\rho\alpha, \tau\acute{\alpha} \delta\epsilon\upsilon\rho\omicron \mu\omicron\lambda\acute{\omega}\nu \mu\omicron\iota \acute{\iota}\pi\acute{\epsilon}\sigma\chi\epsilon\tau\omicron$, and 337. $\acute{\epsilon}\gamma\omega \delta' \acute{\eta}\tau\epsilon\acute{\omicron}\nu$

σε ἕκαστα. The subject is discussed in *H.G.*², 335 ff., where a very doubtful set of cases is collected to show "a less strict usage" in the *Doloneia*, but where not one of our present cases seems to be quoted. Invariability of usage is not, however, asserted, and it is admitted that the subject needs more detailed investigation. I have not discovered that any such has ever been made. Editors generally are not strict to mark exceptions, as they do not lay down rules or refer to those stated by Monro. Mr. Agar (*Homericæ*, 2) remarks how easily a deviation occurs, and any extensive examination of the poems will confirm that; exceptional cases are numerous. And one must bear in mind how frequently enclitics, short monosyllables especially, have been inserted or transferred. We know that the desire to cure hiatus that was deemed illicit was an active cause. Among other references to the point, Kühner-Blass, I, 337 ff., may be quoted, and for the influence of the meter, an important consideration, Gieseke's *Hom. Forschungen*, 57 ff., and Hoffmann, *Quaestt. Hom.*, I, 10. In the *H.G.* it is stated that the usage in the poems is stricter than in later Greek, but the apparent difference may be due in no small measure to the constant recurrence in the poems of standing epic commonplace and fixed phrases.

The objections in the four cases are not specifically stated. In the first, how is τοι to be taken? If it is an ordinary dative, it is much like I. 142, γαμβρός κέν μοι ἔοι, and many other instances. If with Ebeling, and as seems preferable, we take it as the ethical dative, something between the ordinary dat. and the particle, parallels are plentiful, as ξ 508, αἶνος μὲν τοι ἀμύμων, υ 34, or θ 195. If it be the position of τοι relatively to οὐ that is bad, I do not think another occurrence of οὐ . . . οὐ with τοι is to be found. One might compare γ 27 f., οὐ γὰρ ὀίω οὐ σε θεῶν ἀέκητι γενέσθαι. But in fact the position of τοι, like that of other particles, varies considerably—even in the same line (as ο 81). There are even exceptions to the general rule that it follows οὐ, as in μ 118 and σ 230 (cf. Ω 538). And, finally, if regard be had to the quite unusual concatenation of οὐ's in the two lines preceding 247, it is difficult to see how the τοι could be better placed.

In the next two cases, ω 332 and 335, qualifying words come before the enclitic. One would like to see exact parallels with the

enclitic elsewhere. But it seems enough to refer to cases sufficiently similar, as ν 359, $\alpha\lambda\kappa\epsilon\nu\ \epsilon\tilde{\alpha}\ \pi\rho\acute{o}\phi\rho\omega\nu\ \mu\epsilon\ .\ .\ .\ .$, Π 8 ff, $\eta\ .\ .\ .\ .$ $\delta\alpha\kappa\rho\nu\acute{o}\epsilon\sigma\sigma\alpha\ \delta\acute{\epsilon}\ \mu\iota\nu\ \pi\omicron\tau\iota\delta\acute{\epsilon}\rho\kappa\epsilon\tau\alpha\iota$, A 520 f., $\eta\ \delta\acute{\epsilon}\ \kappa\alpha\iota\ \alpha\upsilon\tau\omega\varsigma\ \mu'\ \alpha\iota\acute{\epsilon}\nu\ .\ .\ .\ .$ $\nu\epsilon\iota\kappa\epsilon\tilde{\iota}$. See also η 261, δ 618 f., μ 297, Ω 779 f. In 332 μ' may have got misplaced. But it appears in strange places, as in Σ 189, 432. And as to ω 337, parallels seem to abound— $\pi\acute{\epsilon}\mu\pi\epsilon\ \delta\acute{\epsilon}\ \mu'$, $\phi\iota\lambda\epsilon\tilde{\iota}\ \delta\acute{\epsilon}\ \acute{\epsilon}$, $\kappa\acute{\epsilon}\lambda\epsilon\alpha\iota\ \mu\epsilon$, and, with double accusative, $\epsilon\sigma\sigma\omega\ \mu\iota\nu\ \chi\lambda\alpha\iota\nu\alpha\nu$. It is difficult to find a case against the book on these materials. And observe this—three of the alleged faults are within 6 consecutive lines. In the remaining 618 lines in the "Continuation," the poet, living in the later period of decadence which we are to suppose was characterized by this particular laxity, has "floundered" (almost) without a tumble. Surely we should "greet him not without a welcome," like Tennyson after his "metrification of Catullus."

Here may be mentioned a matter over which commentators have boggled— $\chi\alpha\rho\acute{\iota}\epsilon\sigma\sigma\alpha\nu$, ω 198, after its noun, $\alpha\omicron\iota\delta\acute{\eta}\nu$, in 197. "If an epithet is added in the following line it regularly begins the line" (Monro). Not *regularly*; exceptions are numerous. A few from the Iliad are X 408 f., Δ 477 f., Π 367 f., Ω 4 f., N 709 f. The syntax of the sentence seems as natural as that of γ 58 f., and on the whole it may be said there is as little against the Continuator in regard to syntax as there is in regard to the individual words he uses and the way he uses them. I now turn to his verse.

5. *Meter, with synizesis and contraction.*—First, two cases of improper lengthening: ψ 361, $\acute{\epsilon}\pi\iota\tau\acute{\epsilon}\lambda\lambda\omega$. "This scansion is indefensible by Homeric rules," which probably means that the lengthening is not justifiable by any consideration. The mere effect of the ictus will not be deemed sufficient. An exact parallel will be demanded. $\Delta\acute{\alpha}$ and $\acute{\epsilon}\tau\epsilon\tilde{\iota}$ will be scouted as not near enough. In $\acute{\epsilon}\pi\iota\lambda\acute{\iota}\gamma\delta\eta\nu$, P 599, the ι gets the benefit of the following λ ; in $\acute{\epsilon}\pi\iota\eta\lambda\epsilon\nu$, χ 49, it is said the $\tilde{\iota}$ may be due to the augment, though no other occurrence of a past tense of $\acute{\iota}\alpha\lambda\lambda\omega$ is augmented; and in $\acute{\epsilon}\pi\iota\ \kappa\alpha\kappa\acute{o}\nu$, μ 209 (where $\acute{\epsilon}\pi\epsilon\iota$ is read, but rejected by M. and R. as a dodge), the words are separate. $\pi\acute{\alpha}\rho\acute{\epsilon}\chi\epsilon\iota$, τ 113, is a good parallel, but $\ast\sigma\acute{\epsilon}\chi\omega$ is postulated, and Homer *may* have felt the σ .¹

¹ But see Solmsen, *Untersuchungen*, 9 f.

ἐπεὶ is explained by *ἐπρεῖ*, *ῥφιν* by *ῥφιν* or *οῦφιν*, and of *διὰ* it has even been said that it is due to the influence of *διὰ*—so hard are the authorities pushed to explain every one of the swarming “peculiarities” of the text. In our case there is a *v.l.* *ἐπιστέλλω*, which Schultze (*Q.E.*, 469) accepts, but only to fling it in the face of the “Continuator”; as it would mean in ψ what it meant afterward in Attic, it is of course a sign of lateness. The compound does occur, Δ 384, in *imesi*. But it is better to keep *ἐπιτέλλω*, and, if something must be said to justify an ictus-lengthening, one might suggest the effect of an initial σ , as in *πᾶρέχει*—if *τέλλω* and *στέλλω* are forms of the same word (L. and S., comparing *στέγω*, *τέγος*, *tego*; *τρέπω*, *στρέφω*; and *στέρφος*, *τέρφος*).¹ But the etymological lexica leave the connections of the word obscure, and we may suspend judgment till they are clear. If we avail ourselves of the privilege of emending, we have Mr. Agar’s *σοὶ δ’ ἐπὶ ταῦτα, γύναι, τέλλω*, where the *ταῦτα*, however, if not indefensible, is not so good as the *τάδ’* of the vulgate.

ἐπέεσσιν πευρηθῆναι, ω 240 (final): a breach of Wernicke’s law. We may for present purposes accept the law, and hesitate to believe with Mr. Agar (in the discussion in *C.R.*, XI, 28, 29, 151–54, to which Monro refers) that “Wernicke” was imposed on the text in late days. But there are exceptions in plenty. In our case we can claim indulgence; the two words constitute a “syntactical unit” (Leaf, *Iliad*, Vol. II, 638). It *may* be the case, though it sounds odd, that the origin of “Wernicke” was that hearers were apt to think a hexameter closed when they had heard only two-thirds of it. But no reader that ever existed could have imagined that at *ἐπέεσσιν* in our line. Another word *must* come. The statement that our case is “the only real exception” is one which I cannot understand. See Leaf, *loc. cit.*, and for the *Odyssey*, e.g., β 330, ζ 93, θ 377(?), 530, λ 338, ρ 573 and τ 576. And the fault cannot be considered worse than another which is not uncommon in both poems in the 4th thesis—a long vowel or diphthong retaining its length though followed by an initial vowel. Mr. Agar (*C.R.*, *loc. cit.*) would restore ν *ἐφ*. in the 4th thesis in a number of cases.

But there is another objection. It is “the only instance in the

¹ *ἐπιτέλλειν* wohl nur aus *ἐπιστέλλειν* verkürzt (Schmidt, *Synonymik*, p. 55.)

Odyssey of ν ἐφ. forming position in the fourth thesis," which sounds horrific, till one examines the statistics. These are given by Isler, *Quaestl. Metricae*. If there is a fault, the *Iliad* keeps the "Continuation" in countenance, not with M 55 alone (ὑπερθεν δέ), as usually stated, but also with κέν τοι (Δ 353, I 359). The *productio* is common in the 1st thesis, rarer in the 3d, while the 4th gives only the cases mentioned. But Isler's statistics show that this was not a vice coming into fashion at the supposed late date when the *Odyssey* was completed by the "Continuator." On the contrary, it had vanished from epic poetry before that time. There is not a case in Hesiod or the Hymns, or in the later epics. As to the vice itself, one might ask if it differs in gravity from the numerous cases of the type Τέλης ἐξ ἵπποβότοιο, Δ 202, or θεῶν ἐξ ἔμμορε τιμῆς, ε 335. It only remains to add that the blot has been removed by emendations so light—ἔπεσιν ἐο (Gerhard), and -οισι ἔπεσσι τι (Agar)—that outside a condemned tract no one would hesitate to admit one or the other.

In addition, there are several cases of synizesis and contraction. To begin with what is deemed the worst case of the former, οὐκ ὄγχνη, οὐ πρασιή, ω 247. "The synizesis is hardly to be paralleled in Homer." Is it not paralleled in the common ἦ οὐ, ἐπεὶ οὐ, or δὴ αὖ? On ἐγὼ δ' ἥτεόν σε ἕκαστα, ω 337, Monro has no note, but on τ 34 we are told that χρύσεον is "not Homeric." The same language is used by Leaf of Πηλέος (on A 489). How is "Homeric" employed here? What does it mean? Not that the synizesis does not occur elsewhere in Homer, for there are a number of examples—ἄφρεον, ἠρίθμεον, etc. And lastly, τεύχεα, final in ω 534. Again, "the use of such a form as the final spondee is not Homeric." It recurs in X 322 and H 207. Must one be satisfied with an arbitrary dictum of this description?

And contraction. προῦπεμψα, ω 360, "the only Homeric instance of a compound of πρό in which we cannot write the uncontracted προε." The author happens to use in the first foot a form which others use in other parts of the verse. He does so himself in ω 82, 319, but he will get no credit for it. Ludwich (*Aristarchus*, II, 262, n.) and Cauer (Preface to *Odyssey*, school ed., xxx) make ω 360 ground for objecting to the resolution of the forms elsewhere. Agar

would read πέμψ' ἐγώ. θάμβευς, ω 394, "not Homeric. See *H.G.*, § 105, 3." Turning to the *H.G.*, we find that in θάμβευς, Ἐρέβευς and the like, "it is probably better to write -εος and admit synizesis." But the synizesis εο is, we have seen, not Homeric either. What are we to do? Mr. Agar reads τάφοιο, but that is surely simply a substitution to evade a supposed difficulty. And does not τάφος ὁ mean "funeral"? Ὀδυσσεύς, ω 398, "is certainly not a Homeric form." If this means that it does not occur elsewhere, it is correct. Ὀδυσῆ, τ 136, is passed without remark, only the *v.l.* Ὀδυσῆα ποθεῖσα, a remedy as bad as the disease, and Fick's πόσιν ποθέουσα, being quoted in the *app. crit.* Ὀδυσσῆα, Λ 346, is solitary; Ὀδυσσέα, only ζ 212, ρ 301. And is Ὀδυσσεύς any worse than Πηλῆος? Bekker (*Hom. Bl.*, I, 40 f.) makes Ὀδυσσεύς ground for writing Πηλεῖς. Ὀδυσσεός and Ὀδυσσέως were impossible for the hexameter. Even Ὀδυσσέος is found only Δ 491. In our passage we may read Ὀδυσσέως. ω 416 is quoted by Eustathius with Ὀδυσσεύς. Εὐπείθει, ω 465, "contraction not Homeric." καταπρηνεί, Π 792, ν 164, and προαλεί, Φ 262 (not to mention contracted datives from -ος forms), are well vouched, and not to be expelled. Menrad (*De contract. et syniz. usu Homco.*, 75) excuses them as before a caesura, and Εὐπείθει as final. But our word occurs in an interesting passage, which is discussed by Mr. Agar, and many will be tempted to agree with him that Εὐπείθει has somehow displaced Ἀλιθέρη. And lastly, Ἐρμῆς, ω 1: "This contraction is post-Homeric." As it occurs in ξ 435, "there must be some doubt of the genuineness of 435-36" (Monro *a.l.*). In ω 10, where the "Continuator" knows Ἐρμείας, that form is "a poetical archaism" subsisting along with the new one. This does not strike one as fair criticism. Besides ω 1 (where van Leeuwen proposes ψυχᾶς δ' Ἐρμείας) and ξ 435, Ἐρμῆς is found also in τ 72, ε 54 and θ 334.¹

This form Ἐρμῆς occurs in the first line of the *Second Nekyia* (ω 1-204), and in regard to the form its author is kept well in countenance by other Homeric poets. And be it observed, this latest of all the late interlopers has not a slip of the kind in the other 203 lines written by him. Not only that, but, so far as I can see, the

¹ Sitte (*Die Aeolismen der homer. Sprache*, p. 11) would read Ἐρμείας with synizesis.

case against him, so far as it can be based on his language and verse, rests on *πρῶϊ* and *ζώννυνται* alone!

But to return to the instances of synizesis and contraction. They raise the large question, Were these phenomena foreign to Homer? No one would assert that the would-be expurgators of the text have proved this. You cannot get rid of all such impurities. Even in the "blameless *Menis*," *θεοί*, *ζώντος* and *Πηλεΐδῃ* 'θελ' resist their efforts. Menrad's heroic venture is well known. How far did it succeed? Were his methods unimpeachable? Let Ludwich and others say. Will another Menrad ever renew the enterprise? *μάλα τις θρασυκάρδιος ἔσται*. It is interesting to find Jebb—*quo non peritior aller*—citing Homer's *τεχνήσσαι* and *τιμῆντα* as precedents for Sophocles' *τολμήσσετε* (*Philoct.* 984). A very different attitude this from that of him who has been called the Homeric "smasher"!

So much for Monro's attack. Spohn's lists and discussions do not help. Knowledge of the Homeric language had not advanced far in his day, and his work is now little more than a curiosity. The Digamma has bare mention. He tells us that *abstracta* are more common in the *Odyssey* than in the *Iliad*, and so propounds or propagates a falsity that *volitabat per ora virum*, Croiset and Cauer included, till it came to the ears of Professor Scott—*ἄφαρ δ' ἀνάπυστα θεοὶ θέσαν ἀνθρώποισι*. Thirty-six of Spohn's pages are devoted to Greek diminutives, as a preparation for the discussion of *κλισιον*, the word to which Dorotheus of Askalon devoted his whole life. In fact the linguistic parts of this treatise, on which Wolfians of every shade of belief have lavished an anti-Homeric confidence for nearly a century, are utterly valueless. The other contents will have separate notice. Few discrepancies and incongruities have escaped the micrological examination of Spohn.

In conclusion, there is one very important matter for the enemies of this section of the *Odyssey* to consider. We know from the many treatises, the hundreds of treatises, which the nineteenth century hurled at the various parts of the poems, that the individuals who manipulated or composed these books and passages lived in a decadent age, when the epic and its language were alike past their bloom. They had not an accurate sense of the old and genuine bardic dialect.

So in many points of language they constantly made mistakes, and through these mistakes their intrusions have been detected and exposed by modern scholars. These points became standard tests. The late poetaster could be tracked down by any such solecism. And yet, tested by these tests, the "Continuation," this latest of all the late additions to the poems, is absolutely sound and pure! A startling phenomenon, surely, but a fact.

Any reader of this paper must have wondered that there was no mention of the Digamma, the greatest and surest of all such tests. There has been no mention of it because it is not a head of charge in Monro's indictment. That is a very extraordinary fact. Not only that, but hardly any other authority has thought fit to examine the Digamma-phenomena. I have had to make a complete search for myself. Fick (*Odyssey*, 304 f., and *Entstehung der Od.*, 189 f.) has collected some "Ionisms," as his school loves to call them, and neglects of φ are included in the list, and Blass (*Interpol.*, 215) also devotes a few lines to these; but that is all.

Fick here, as elsewhere, gives no assistance whatever. It is utterly futile to draw up a list of blemishes for any part of the poems, and say "there!" But Blass argues the matter intelligently, and separates the *Nekyia* from the rest of ω . In the rest of the book he finds φ is observed; in the *Nekyia* it has vanished from the author's speech. There are observances, it is true, but these are all in what are stigmatized as "borrowed" verses or parts of verses. That is an assumption which requires to be proved, and which it is preposterous to state without proof. Nor is his list of observances complete; far from it.

An exhaustive examination of the phenomena shows that the *Nekyia* and the rest of the "Continuation," and the "Continuation" and the rest of the poems, are, as regards observances and neglects of φ , in exactly the same case. I have drawn out particulars, but do not propose to waste words on them. It is the neglects that scholars fasten on to impugn a given passage, and in the "Continuation" they are numerous, *but*, not more numerous than in, say, the first book of the *Iliad*. If they prove the "Continuation" late, they prove A late; if they are to be amended in A, to save its face, the "Continuation" is entitled to the same indulgence. A compari-

son will not damage it. To make that as satisfactory as possible, the best plan, perhaps, is to take the sixteen roots with ϵ found in both it and A, and to compare observances (including or excluding cases of $\nu \epsilon \phi$.) and neglects in words from these roots. The result is, for A, 89 observances and 12 neglects; for the "Continuation," 87 and 15 respectively. But in whatsoever way the comparison may be made, there is nothing against our tract.

Let us pass on to another famous test, the article. The Homeric use of δ had, we are always given to understand, sadly degenerated in the days of the interpolations in and additions to the poems, and the article is another means for detecting the work of late depredators. It amazes us then to find that in our 624 lines Monro can point only to $\xi \delta' \nu \epsilon \iota \varsigma \text{ οἱ Δολίοιο, } \omega 497$, but not without a qualm even there. He himself refers to T 181 and $\Psi 348, 376$, and the point is not worth discussing. We may let it stand, or merely mention that Mr. Agar reads, without altering a letter, $\xi \delta', \nu \epsilon \iota \varsigma \text{ οἱ Δολίοιο}$.

So the article also fails. But there are many other tests. We know how much has been made of prepositional uses, especially in regard to the "Odyssean" books of the *Iliad*. So far as I am aware, not one abuse or innovation is alleged against our author. And we must say the same of pseudoarchaisms, another Mark of the Beast, unless $\eta \eta \nu$ is to be classed in that category. And if we go on to Ionisms, as Fick, Robert and others call any blemish which they wish to turn to account, we find the same result. Let us take three of their favorites, the iterative verbs, $\epsilon \varsigma$ and $\alpha \nu$. The iteratives are not so numerous as in Λ or X . On $\epsilon \varsigma$ and $\alpha \nu$ no imputation at all can be based. In short, the popular tests fail all along the line. One might, for completeness' sake, add the metrical faults of neglect of position and hiatus, which were used to depreciate the "Odyssean" books of the *Iliad*. There is no case here either. Position is observed and neglected ($\alpha \lambda \lambda \delta \tau \rho \iota \eta \varsigma$ and all the rest) just as elsewhere in the poems. I find two cases of *hiatus illicitus*— $\eta \delta \epsilon \epsilon \phi \alpha \sigma \kappa \epsilon, \psi 335$, where it is believed ϵ has slipped out (cf. $\epsilon 135$ and $\eta 256$), and $\eta \rho \alpha \epsilon \tau' \epsilon \sigma \tau \acute{\epsilon}, \omega 351$, where there is a *v.l.* $\eta \rho' \epsilon \tau \iota$, and where $\alpha \rho'$ has been conjectured. If tests are to be depended on, the language and verse are very "Homeric" in the best sense of that much abused word.

What then is to be our conclusion regarding the language of the "Continuation"? That depends on our estimate of the effect of the individual blots which have been examined in detail. We may admit a small residuum of "peculiarity." But which book in the poems does not provide as much? As to its effect, opinions will differ according to the general attitude of the individual critic. At one extreme we have Fick. He notes every fault, seldom troubles to consider whether there is a *v.l.*, whether a simple emendation is practicable or interpolation a possible explanation, or whether the *Anstoss* may be due to maltreatment of the text in transmission. There are the blots, and the passage is late. At the other extreme is Mr. Agar with the merciful view that many of the defects are due to what is certainly an intelligible cause, the havoc played by transcribers, editors, and others during centuries, and ready to cure them by reference to the practice of the epics so far as he can discover it from their text. Even so, many of the peculiarities in all parts of the poems defy explanation or removal, and when any part which is habitually vilified is to be condemned on account of any such unexplained residuum, our only resource is to compare it in this respect with what are supposed to be its betters. The "Continuation" is one forty-fifth of the whole Homeric corpus. It must have its share of peculiarity. Is that greater than the residuum for the first book of the *Iliad*? It is not. The comparison may be made in detail, and the "Continuation" need not fear it. And then there is the comforting fact that, judged by all the approved tests, its language stands foursquare.

So far as language goes, the "Continuation" is not separated in age from the rest of the poems. We shall see that the same may be said in regard to other heads of charge which have still to be considered. And even then Herr Cauer and Professor Murray will say, as they have said of the *Doloneia*, the one "pooh! *can't* you see that it can be cut out?" and the other, "the style is enough for me."
καί κ' ἀλὰδὲ διακρίνεται.

ST. ANDREWS
SCOTLAND

CATULLUS CARMEN 2

BY EDWIN W. FAY

Against the attacks of Professors Phillimore and Postgate (see V, 217; VII, 1) I would venture a defense of the substantial integrity of Catullus' first *passer*¹ poem. Both these scholars challenge the Latinity of (*cum*) *desiderio meo nitenti . . . (lubet)*, whereas, I admire it as much as Friedrich or Munro ("bright lady of my longing love"), venturing to believe that if either of our recent censors has correctly restored the original, then blind fortune and blundering copyists have surpassed it in true poetry. At this stage of his amour—though that is begging the question—Catullus would scarcely have risked the *bêtise* of taxing Lesbia with a longing for himself.

The truth is that Professor Phillimore in his attack on the Latinity of *cum desiderio meo lubet* has put up a man of straw to batter down. Let us grant that *lucis meae oculos* must rather be expressed by *tuos, lux mea, oculos* and that *desiderio meo* must rather be *tibi, desiderium meum*: let us grant it, that is, for direct second-person sentences; but what of sentences wherein *tuos* and *tibi* must refer to the *passer*, while *lux* or *desiderium* refers to Lesbia, as here, where *desiderio* is very pointedly in the third person?

To what extent had *desiderium*, as a pet name, become a proper name? Is no weight to be attached to the fact that by its ending in *-ium* our noun fell into a class with all the names of mistresses and poppets on the comic stage, such as *Erotium* and *Paegnium*? Did *Desiderio meo lubet* substantially differ in syntax from *placuerdo huic Erotio* (Plautus *Men.* 670)? To what extent had *desiderium* sunk to a mere ordinary noun, liable to all the range of *coniugium*, which from

¹ In his *Greek Birds*, s.v. *σποῦθος*, Thompson goes out of his way to declare his conviction that Lesbia's *passer* could not have been a common house sparrow, and for the general unfriendliness of this bird he refers to Bechstein's book on *Cage and Chamber Birds*. I think we may read between the lines of Catullus' second and third poems that Lesbia's sparrow was a jealous and unfriendly creature. Its general bad character was redeemed by its jealous and exclusive devotion to Lesbia (iii. 7-10). This devotion to a selected person is entirely accordant with Bechstein's tale (p. 249) of the belled sparrow of the Hôtel des Invalides: "It would not allow itself to be touched by any other person, yet was so fond of its master that it could not be induced to leave him, when at last he became bedridden."

Accius on and in Catullus (68. 107) designated a wife? How should *desiderium* differ from "darling," "beloved," τὸ ἐρωμένιον, *puella*?

But to be specific: the objection to *desiderio* or *luci* (for that is Phillimore's instance) in the dative meets its answer by the consideration of Lucilius 1138-41:

Cornelius Publius noster
Scipiadas dicto tempus quae intorquet in ipsum
oti et deliciis, *luci effictae* atque cinaedo et
sectatori adeo ipse suo, quo rectius dicas.

Besides, the dative of Catullus seems almost imitated by Ovid, to his lady's parrot (*Am.* 2. 6. 19):

quid iuvat, ut *datus es*, nostrae placuisse *puellae*.

This may be compared with Catullus 104. 1:

credis me potuisse meae maledicere *vitae*.

Further examples of a dative are:

Plautus *Curc.*: 11-12:

Egon apicularum opera congestum non feram
Ex dulci oriundum melculo dulci meo?

Most. 167:

volo meo placere Philolachi, meo oculo, meo patrono.

Professor Postgate's challenge of the propriety of using *nitenti* with *desiderio* may also seem to fall with Lucilius' *luci effictae*. The propriety of *nitens* may be vindicated by Cat. 68. 70, *mea candida diva*; 13. 4, *non sine candida puella* (cf. Horace *Epod.* 11. 27), for certainly *puella*, "mistress," does not seriously differ from *desiderium*, "beloved." As an epithet, there would be analogy between *desiderium* and a proper name. Cf. *Daphnis me malus urit* (Virgil *Ecl.* 8. 83) with *urit me Glycerae nitor*. Certainly *Glycera nitens* would not be bad Latin, and Catullus actually does say (*uxor ore floridulo nitens* (61. 193)). If the bride was there *nitens* why not his mistress (*desiderium*) here?

But the question really turns on the usage of *desiderium* by lovers, and the pitiful little salvage of Roman love-speech embalmed in our classic authors, and surely not exhausted in the *Casina* 134-38. *Poenulus* 365-68, ought never to be relied upon to prove a negative. For *desiderium* we might know more if we had an adequate record of Πόθος (two examples in Friedrich, *ad hunc locum*) and Ἰμερος

in Greek but, quite out of literature, a gladiator was featured on the billboards at Pompeii as *totius orbis desiderium* (CIL, IV, 1184), and a bereaved husband, C. Maenius Cimber, paid tribute to his wife as *desiderio* (dat.) *spiritus mei* (*ibid.*, VI, 7579).

Somewhere toward the confines of literature we have an instance of *desiderium* with a qualifying adjective and with *suum*, and in a context distinctly reminiscent of Catullus, viz., in Pliny *N.H.* 11. 148 (cited as 12. 148 in the *Thesaurus*), where we find him speaking of the power of the pupil of the eye to reflect the whole image of a person. He continues:

ea causa est ut plerique alitum e manibus [= "pet birds"] hominum oculos potissimum appetant, quod effigiem suam in his cernentes velut ad cognata desideria sua tendunt.

Why does Pliny in speaking of pet birds use *appetant* and *desideria*, two of the striking words of our *passer* poem? For one of two reasons, not mutually exclusive: first, in full or half-conscious reminiscence of this poem. He called Catullus his *conterraneus*, and had got no farther than the fifth line of his *Natural History* before quoting, with deliberate attempt to improve:

namque tu solebas
nugas esse aliquid meas putare [C. 1. 3].

He alludes there also to C. 12. 17, and refers to Catullus by name in at least four other places (28. 19: Cat. 64. 323 [?]; 36. 48: 29. 3; 36. 154: 1. 2; 37. 81: 52), so the only wonder here is that Catullus is not actually named. The second explanation is that *desiderium* was a general pet name belonging to talk with birds. As Pliny here uses it, it corresponds to the pet name *ocellus* of the Plautine lover's vocabulary. For pet birds the *desiderium* was the supposed image of the beloved in the eyes of their mistresses: Catullus' beloved was his *desiderium*, his *ocellus*, and what lover thinking of Clodia "Boopis" (for so Cicero habitually nicknamed her) but might have described her as his *ocellus* (*desiderium*)¹ *nitens*? Cf. Virgil's *oculi nitentes* and other like uses of *niteo* and *nitens* recorded in the lexica.

¹ And one word more on *desiderium* of the reflected image in the eyes. Stephanus in his *Thesaurus*, s.v. "ἱμερος," writes: "est etiam Id in oculis quo intuentium amor conciliatur," citing the technological writer Pollux (2.63), a century after Pliny, for καὶ τὸ ἀπ' αὐτῶν ἀπορρέον ἱμερος, and if Stephanus was troubled for the definition of ἀπορρέον, he should have bethought himself of the philosophical term ἀπορροαί-εἶδωλα (so Hesychius).

I am personally convinced of the integrity of *Carmen* 2 as it stands in a conservative text like Simpson's, and the difficulties raised seem to me to meet their solution if we interpret the poem on the following theory of its composition, viz., that at an early period of their acquaintance Lesbia became angry with Catullus and banished him from her presence (cf. the record of such a quarrel, later on, in *C.* 8). In his efforts to regain admittance he despatched a note superscribed with some form of words such as *Catullus passeri, melculo desiderioque suae puellae*, something to pique angry Clodia into opening the note.

If this reconstruction of the setting of the poem be admitted, it commits us to taking *doloris* (l. 7) as "vexation" and *ardor* (l. 8) as "hot resentment." In brief, I would take *ardor*, and incidentally *dolor*, as substantially equivalent to *ira*. For this definition, note the following statistics:

1. *Ardor* and *ira*.—Lucretius, 3. 289, in *ira* | cum fervescit et ex oculis micat acrius ardor; Cic. *De div.* 1. 61, *irarum* existit ardor (cf. Mart. 6. 64. 24, bilis ardor); Livy 5. 41. 4, sine ira, sine ardore animorum ("free from resentment or heat of passion," Spillan); *ibid.*, 1. 10. 3; 24. 30. 1; Cic. *Tusc.* 4. 78; *Phil.* 13. 15; 4. 4. Cf. *ardens* (*ardet*), Cat. 64. 198, "zorn-glühend" (Friedrich), in contrast with 62. 23 = "liebe-glühend"; Horace *S.* 1. 4. 48; Livy 2. 56. 13; Virgil *Aen.* 2. 575; Cic. *Att.* 2. 19. 5, *Tusc.* 2. 58; Terence *Ad.* 710, ardeo iracundia; Plautus *Cpt.* 594, ardent oculi (of a madman); cf. ardet mente (*Culex* 179); ardet et odit (Juvenal 9. 96).

2. *Ardor* and *furor*.—Cic. *Phil.* 13. 18, quo furore, quo ardore; cf. *Phil.* 3. 3.

3. *Ardor* and *dolor*.—Some glossist to our passage has written *dolor* for *ardor*. The connotation of *ira* is clear in Cic. *Brut.* 277, ubi dolor, ubi ardor animi? *De or.* 1. 197, vi et dolore et ardore animi concitans (note in the glosses a <r>dore animi "indignatio"). But *ardor* comes nearer to the sense of *dolor* (i.e., "pain")—cf. Tibullus 2. 5. 110 and 3. 6. 3 where *dolor* is the pain of unrequited love; 3. 2. 6; 3. 2. 13, where it is the pain of bereavement—when contrasted with *voluptas*, as in Lucretius 3. 251; cf. Cic. *De fin.* 2. 14, inserting (from *Cael.* 37) after *animus ardet nunc meum cor cumulat ira*; *Att.* 2. 19. 5, ardet dolore et ira. In these passages *ardor* is a heightened *dolor*.

4. In the following passages *ardor* is even an exaggerated *ira*, perhaps; Cic. *Fam.* 6. 12. 4; *Marc.* 24, in tanto civili bello, tanto animorum ardore; *Leg.* 9; Silius Ital. *Pun.* 17. 491, iamque ardore truci lustrans; Livy 6. 13. 2, vultum . . . ardore animi micantem; *Culex* 222, sanguineumque micant ardorem; Laberius 26, ardore ignescitur.

5. Possibly, in our context, *gravis* fastens on *ardor* the sense of "anger," so clearly exhibited in the previous examples by *ardor animi*. We have in

Horace *gravis stomachus* (*C.* 1. 6. 6) and *graves iras* (3. 3. 30). Cicero furnishes examples of *gravis* with *dolor*, *ira*, *inimicitiae*, *iracundia* (*Tusc.* 3. 11, *graviore*); cf. also *odiosi et graves* (*Rep.* 1. xliii). Ovid also has *gravis dolor*. The adverb *graviter* is combined with *iratus sum* (Terence *Hec.* 623), with *angi* (*De amic.*) and *graviter commotus* is glossed by *g. iratus*. Cf. also Tacitus *Ann.* 13. 36. 5, *quod Corbulo graviter accepit et increpitum Paccium . . . iussit*. Further see Lewis and Short, *s.v. graviter*, and cf. *gravatus*, always of a feeling of vexation. With these examples before me I am not attracted by Munro's definition of *gravis ardor* as a "violent and absorbing passion," even when confronted with a context like *studium et ardorem quendam amoris* (*De or.* 1. 134); cf. Horace *Ep.* 11. 2, *amore percussus gravi*, and, in vs. 27, *ardor* = "love" (see Catullus 62.23, cited in 1).

So many other exegetical difficulties have been raised regarding our poem, however, that I must go yet further in defense of its integrity. The long interval between the address to the *passer* and the introduction to the wish is awkward, but Friedrich's general defense is satisfying: "vss. 1-7 constitute a long-spun-out address, and vs. 8 is not joined to them quite correctly. That is, however, only a trifling inconcinnity, pardonable in colloquial speech." Just as awkward parentheses may be found in Catullus 65. 5-14, and in Horace *C.* 3. 17. 2-9; cf. also Catullus 44. 2-4 and Horace *Ep.* 1. 15. 2-13 and 16-21, where the main verb of the first sentence is deferred till vs. 25.

Difficulty has also been felt with *et solacium*, but it is quite hypercritical to object to construing *solacium* as one construes *carum nescioquid*. A somewhat new emphasis may be given to this explanation by noting that *et* adds here a virtual appositive to *carum nescioquid*. This is the *et* that Friedrich (*Catullus*, p. 369) renders by *nämlich* in Virgil *Geor.* 4. 64.

tinnitusque cie et Matris quate cymbala circum.¹

A most apposite example for our passage is Horace *C.* 4. 12. 6:

infelix avis et Cecropiae domus aeternum opprobrium,

wherein the *et*-clause does duty for a relative almost. Cf. Propertius 3. 12. 22, *lotosque herbaeque tenaces*, where the *lotus* is the *herba tenax*. There is an excellent collection of examples for this *et* of apposition in Rothstein's *Propertius*, 1. 8. B. 35-36 (p. 56). Rothstein's list, besides the two examples given, contains Propertius 2. 9. 13; 3. 7. 29;

¹ See other examples of *et* and *-que* on p. 367 and cf. p. 145 on *et* = "and that too."

Aeneid 1. 41; 5, 647; Ovid *Her.* 4. 91; to which may be added *Aeneid* 6. 282 and perhaps 6. 296; 6. 467; Terence *Ph.* 199; Lucilius 194 (?). In this usage the copula, *et* or *-que*, does not differ in force from the copula in hendiadys.

Offense has also been caused by *credo* (vs. 8), in the sense of "doubtless," Germ. *natürlich*. Here *credo* ratifies the statements of fact involved in "some endearment which is a solace of her vexation": "I can well believe it," adds Catullus. We find a comparable example, but not so light in tone, in Cicero *Marc.* 25:

saepe enim venit ad aures meas te idem istud nimis crebro dicere tibi satis te vixisse. credo: sed tum id audirem, si tibi soli viveres, aut si tibi etiam soli natus esses.

So in *Carm.* 84, after criticizing Arrius' cockney *h-*, Catullus goes on, *credo*: (of course he speaks with an *h-*, for¹) *sic mater . . . avunculus — avus dixerat*.

Touching *ut* (vs. 8), even if Catullus had no other instance of *ut* = *utinam* (cf. 66. 48), we need not question it here. Not but there remains a difficulty with the *ut*—its great separation, to wit, from *passer*, due to the intervention of three parentheses, viz.: of vss. 2-4 (relative), vss. 5-7 (temporal), and last of *credo* (8). If we only knew how the Romans managed their phrasing in reading! It were so easy to draw *ut* and *passer* together by speaking both words at the same pitch, with the intervening parentheses each in a pitch of its own; nor is it unthinkable that such a sentence-stress fell upon *ut* that the metrical value of *cred° ut* was not $\underline{\text{L}}>$, but rather —: $\underline{\text{L}}$

To those who still stumble at the long parenthesis, and are not reconciled by the parallels cited above, my interpretation may be made, in its general aspect, more acceptable by either of the following emendations:

a) By the change of *credo*, to *quaero* or rather *quaeso*, following in part Sir E. Maunde Thompson in *Am. Jour. Phil.* XXI, 78.

Thompson's ipse dixit were enough of itself to prove the *ductus* confusion, in semi-uncials, of *quae-* and *cre-*, but I have been at pains to verify it in the facsimiles accessible to me. Thus in half-uncials *qu-* looks like C|²

¹ Here "for" is a translation of *sic*. The paratactic type of *for*-sentence introduced by *ita* is very common in Plautus (see my *Mostellaria*, § 74. 3). The construction of the *sic*-clause as parataxis for *O.O.* after *credo* seems to me much less convincing than to take *credo* with the previous statement.

(cf. Thompson, *Pal.*, p. 201), or like C| \sim (cf. Chatelain, *Unc. script.*, pl. 66, col. 1, 3d line from end; Wessely, *Schrifttaf.*, Tab. VI, No. 13, where, in uncials on stone, anno 301, we have C| \sim L <=qui>, end of 2d line, C| \sim AE <=quae>, middle of 5th line; Wattenbach¹, p. 62, sub V, l. 5). So *quia* as written in Chatelain, *op. cit.*, p. 66, 2d leaf, 1st col., l. 15, looks very like *criia*, and we can but admit the possibility of C| \sim eso being read *creso* and being transcribed *ēso*, subsequently expanded to *credo*.¹ As to the propriety of using *quaeso*, it is enough to refer to 76. 23 (cf. 10. 25; 103. 3), and particularly to Tibullus 1. 1. 58, *tecum dummodo sim, quaeso segnis inersque vocer*.

b) An even simpler emendation which removes another of the old stones of stumbling in the interpretation of our poem, is to read vss. 7-8, pointed as a parenthesis, as follows:

(et solacium's < ? t > eei doloris, credo).

As a mistake in *ductus*, SUI for STEI is most simple, for TEI (or EEI) in capitals was always capable of being read III, whence VI. Lindsay, *Lat. Txt. Emend.*, p. 87, cites, e.g., *avi* for ALII (*Ps.* 633) and *haec cauata* for HAEC ALLATA.

In vs. 9 the wish with *possem* has occasioned difficulty, but the tense seems to me adroitly chosen by Catullus "to indicate the hopelessness of the wish in the present or immediate future" (cf. Lane, *Latin Grammar*, § 1544), and the tense may have been chosen to make Lesbia ask herself whether after all his return to her was impossible. The problem is one of psychology, not of formal grammar; the occasion was one where emotion was made to seem to triumph over syntactical norms. The change to *possim*, so simple as a problem of *ductus*, so offends against the principle of *lectio difficilior* that I deem it entirely inadmissible, and to read *possem* is to exclude *quaero* for *credo*.

Is there a gap between vss. 10 and 11? The testimony of *Guarini* (which I am unable to gauge) apart, there is not the least need to think so. As to construction, *ut . . . possem* is the apodosis to *gratum est*; cf., e.g., Cicero *Fin.* 5. 83: *utinam quidem dicerent alium alio beatiorem: iam ruinas videres*, where the unreality of *dicerent* is again for the immediate future, and *videres*, for all its

¹ In uncials, *d* for *s* is common; cf. Lindsay, *op. cit.*, p. 88. See also Chatelain, *op. cit.*, pl. 19, 2d col, 4th line from end, where in *sensibus*, *set s* with a closed bottom looks like the delta-shaped *d*.

¹ In its folk-lore aspect the story of Atalanta is illuminated by the following extract from Havelock Ellis' *Psychology of Sex*, p. 60: "Among the Malays . . . the damsel, stripped naked of all but a waistband, is given a certain start and runs off on foot followed by her lover."

the last three verses of our poem Catullus is delivering an ultimatum to Lesbia, to wit: iam diu sonatus sum; nisi tu me revocaris peregre abiero. Perhaps. We can never know.

UNIVERSITY STATION
AUSTIN, TEXAS

TWO PINDARIC POEMS OF THEOCRITUS

BY EDWARD B. CLAPP

It is sometimes remarked by critics of Pindar that the great Boeotian was a poet who is more admired than read. And in the main this dictum is doubtless correct. Pindar never was a popular poet, as Homer was popular. His thought was often too obscure, his style too abrupt and rugged, and his rhythm too difficult to allow his poetry to be the favorite reading of cultivated triflers. We may even venture to doubt whether Horace himself had spent hours and days in the reading of Pindar, though no one has praised the Theban eagle more judiciously than he. But I have been struck with the fact that at least one poet in later Greek literature was a close student, as well as an ardent admirer, of Pindar. I refer to no less an artist than Theocritus. The gentle sweetness of the prince of Alexandrians seems widely removed from the flashing vigor of Pindar's poetry. And, indeed, in most of his writings we find comparatively few traces of familiarity with the works of the priestly Theban. But in the sixteenth poem, the "Graces to Hiero," and the seventeenth, the "Praise of Ptolemy," not only is the style to a certain extent Pindaric, but direct reminiscences of Pindar, both in thought and in language, are so frequent that they can only be explained as either the result of conscious imitation, or as the production of a mind so steeped in Pindar that these words and ideas came unconsciously to the poet's pen.

The Pindaric character of poem 16 is too apparent to have escaped observation. It has been noted by Fritzsche in his *Argument*, and briefly discussed by Kuiper in *Mnemosyne*, N.F. 17, p. 378. Holzinger, in his short paper "Theokrit in Orchomenos," *Philologus* LI, 193, devotes himself chiefly to combating the view of Paton and Hicks (*Koisch. Inschrift.*, p. 359), accepted by Christ, *Gesch. d. Griech. Lit.*⁴, p. 539, that poem 16 was sent to Hiero from Orchomenos. But no one of these scholars seems to have called sufficient attention to the fact that poem 17, as well, is full of reminiscences of the Boeotian bard. It has therefore seemed to the present writer to

be worth while to present the facts in regard to both poems, side by side, including a perhaps more adequate statement of the Pindaric echoes in poem 16.

This sixteenth poem, addressed to king Hiero, was probably written when Theocritus contemplated a journey to Syracuse, perhaps to sue for the patronage of the great monarch. The very name of Hiero recalls to mind that older Hiero, whom Pindar praises with so much more independence of spirit. And the alternate title, the "Graces" or *Χάριτες*, plunges the reader at once into the very midst of Pindar's poetic mythology, in which the charm of poetry is so often personified under the name of *Χάριτες*. At the outset of the poem, after dwelling for a few verses on the favorite Pindaric antithesis between the divine and the human as subjects of song, Theocritus introduces his *Χάριτας* with the question, which we must admit is utterly un-Pindaric in its humility, Who will receive our Graces kindly into his house, and not send them away without their due reward? I know not, he answers, for men are no longer eager, as they were of old, to be praised by poets for their noble deeds. They are helpless victims, says our poet, of greed for gain. And the expression which he uses, *νεύκηνται ὑπὸ κερδέων*, reminds us of frequent turns in Pindar, as *αἰδῶς κέρδει κλέπτεται*, *N.* 9. 33, and *ἀλλὰ κέρδει καὶ σοφία δέδεταί*, *P.* 3. 54. Rich men, continues Theocritus, reject our plea for generosity with the trite proverb, "The knee is nearer than the shin," or "Charity begins at home"—an elaborate homeliness of expression quite in the spirit of Pindar's famous saying, "I have upon my tongue the feeling of a shrill whetstone," *O.* 6. 82. Homer, says the niggard patron, is all the poet we need. And then Theocritus turns upon him with the impassioned cry, "What will you gain from all your stored-up gold? For the wise, the best use of wealth is to benefit one's friends, to reward poets, and to make offerings to the gods." Here Theocritus seems to be thinking of passages like *N.* 1. 31 f.: "I love not to keep great wealth hidden in my halls, but from what I have to live happily, and to win a good name by services to my friends." Especially, says Theocritus, one ought to honor the spokesmen of the Muses, in order that even when one is in the abode of Hades, his praises may still be sung in the upper world. Here we are reminded of *I.* 1.

ad fin.: "But if anyone hoards his wealth at home, he does not remember that he must give up his spirit to Hades at last bereft of all honor." Indeed, it is one of the commonplaces of Pindar, that poetry alone can immortalize the fame of the great and good.

Next Theocritus proceeds to mention some of the rich and mighty of this world, including the mythical Aleuas, fabled ancestor of the Aleuadae of Thessaly, of whom Pindar sings in *P.* 10: "They would all be forgotten ere this, had not their fame been hymned by bards." So Pindar in *N.* 7. 12 f., declares that "mighty deeds are wrapped in great darkness, if they lack for song." But the Cean bard, says Theocritus (and it is significant that he mentions Simonides, rather than the poet most in his mind), "made these chieftains immortal in the minds of later generations, with the honors won by their swift steeds." The winning of undying fame by means of prowess in chariot racing is a thoroughly Pindaric touch, and quite outside the sphere of Theocritus. And the word he uses here for later generations is *ὀπλοτέροις*, a rare Homeric comparative, but used not less than three times by Pindar.

Who would have known of the Lycian chiefs, or of the sons of Priam, or of fair Cynus, if poets had not celebrated their battles? Nor would Odysseus be remembered, nor Eumelus, nor Philoetius, nor Laertes, had not the Ionian Homer sung of their brave deeds. Here it is interesting to note that Theocritus recedes from the disparaging view of Odysseus, characteristic of Attic tragedy, and recurs to his heroic aspect in the older fashion, coupling his name with that of Cynus, son of Poseidon, a little-known hero, but twice mentioned, with great respect, by Pindar.

Indeed, this whole passage is so deeply saturated with Pindaric reminiscences that it could have been written only by a poet who was thoroughly imbued with the spirit of his great Theban predecessor. What we see here is no easy external imitation, but the work of a man who knew and loved his Pindar, even as Theocritus himself was known and loved by our own Tennyson. Great glory, continues our poet, comes to men from the Muses alone. As to the man who is smitten with avarice, I take my leave of him. Let him have boundless wealth, but let him be constantly tormented with desire for more. So Pindar says in *N.* 8. 37: "Men pray for gold, and others for

boundless lands." And as the latter adds, "but I would fain cover my limbs with earth amid the love of my fellow-citizens," so Theocritus goes on, "but I prefer the honor and love of men to countless mules and horses."

"But some day I shall find the prince who will take me for his bard. Even now the Phoenicians are trembling at the military preparations of Hiero. May Zeus and Athena and Persephone drive them from the Sicilian isle." The wish, here, recalls the prayer in *P.* 1. 72 f. for the success of the older Hiero. It is adorned, moreover, with a reference to mythical Ephyra, the ancient name of Corinth, the mother-city of Syracuse. Pindar, too, mentions Ephyra more than once, but, oddly enough, not with reference to Corinth, but meaning the Thesprotian or Thessalian Ephyra. And Theocritus goes on, "May poets spread the renown of Hiero beyond the Scythian sea, even to where Semiramis held sway, within her walls of asphalt." In a similar strain Pindar, in *I.* 6. 22, declares that the fame of Aegina has spread "beyond the sources of the Nile. Nor is any city so barbarous in speech as not to have heard of the Aeginetan hero Peleus." Here it is easy to trace the development of the idea in the mind of Theocritus. Pindar's "no city so barbarous in speech" has become, in the later poet, an explicit reference to Nineveh.

At the end of our poem comes a further mention of the Graces, which we have already noticed, both in the title and in the introduction. The latter passage is plainly suggested by Pindar's beautiful fourteenth Olympian, which deals especially with these goddesses. Cf. also *O.* 9. 27; *I.* 1. 6. And while Pindar mentions the Boeothian River Cephissus, Theocritus, who, like any good Alexandrian, knows his mythology, does not fail to introduce Eteocles, the son of the river-god. In short, the evidence is conclusive that Theocritus, in composing his sixteenth poem, not only shows an intimate familiarity with the odes of Pindar in general, but also had certain Pindaric passages particularly in mind.

The indications of Pindaric suggestion are scarcely less striking in poem 17, the "Praise of Ptolemy." The poem begins with an ascription of praise to Zeus, quite in the style of *N.* 2. 3, followed by the sharp antithesis: "But of men, Ptolemy shall be mentioned

first, last, and in the midst." Here no one can fail to be reminded of the splendid proemium of *O.* 2: "What god, what hero, what man shall we celebrate? Truly Pisa is of Zeus, the Olympic Games did Heracles establish as the first fruit of war, and Theron must we proclaim for his victory with the four-horse chariot." "I am at loss," continues Theocritus, "where to begin my praise of Ptolemy, like a wood-cutter on Mount Ida, at loss before the multitude of trees." Ptolemy was born of illustrious sires. His father, Ptolemy Lageides, was deified, and dwells, like Pindar's Heracles, "in a golden chamber in the palace of Zeus, where he enjoys festivity (*θαλίας ἔχει*, a Pindaric turn; cf. *O.* 7. 94) in the company of the other Olympians. Like Alexander the Great, Ptolemy claims descent from Heracles. And Arsinoe, his queen, is equally conspicuous among women. No man ever loved his wife as Ptolemy loves Arsinoe. And she, in turn, loves him still more profoundly—which, by the way, is a most un-Pindaric note. Eilithyia stood by with her assistance when Ptolemy was born, and gave his mother surcease of pain. And here we note a significant touch of Pindar, even in the language. The word used for "surcease of pain" is *νοδυνίαν*, which is almost a *ἄπαξ λεγόμενον*, for Liddell and Scott quote but two occurrences of it, one of which is the present passage, while the other is *P.* 3. 6, where Asclepius is called "author for mortals of surcease of pain." No clearer proof of Pindaric influence could be found, than this repetition of a rare Pindaric word. The birth of Ptolemy was like the birth of Achilles or Diomed. The island of Cos, where he first saw the light, shall be as famous as Delos for the birth of Apollo. The curious personification of the island of Cos, here, is not at all in Pindaric vein, but reminds us strongly of Callimachus in his fourth poem. As the island finishes its address to the future monarch, an eagle, says Theocritus, thrice screamed from the clouds above. In precisely the same way, in Pindar, *I.* 6. 49, when Heracles predicts the birth of Ajax, "the god sent forth a mighty eagle, king of birds." "For Zeus honors great kings," continues Theocritus, "and no land is so rich as Egypt, over which Ptolemy rules. It hath cities 33,000 and 300 and 30 and 3. The sea and the land and the surrounding rivers are subject to him. He is lord of many horsemen and many shield-bearing warriors." So Pindar

praises Hiero, in *P.* 2. 58, as "sovereign prince of many battlemented streets and a mighty host." "The servants of the Muses sing of Ptolemy, in return for the favor he hath bestowed upon them." In the same way, in *P.* 2. 17, "the praises of the Cyprians encompass Cinyras, as a recompense for his many kindly deeds."

And finally, the poem closes in thoroughly Pindaric manner. For not only does Theocritus echo the Pindaric sentiment that wealth must be joined with virtue in order to be the source of true glory (cf. *P.* 5. 1 ff.), but he also adopts one of the most characteristic Pindaric devices for bringing a poem to an end with point and effect. To illustrate, I cite two or three of Pindar's closing sentences: *O.* 3, "I will not pursue it, I should be a fool"; *O.* 5, "Seek not in vain to be a god"; *I.* 3, "Yet free from wounds are the sons of the gods." Thus, with inimitable brevity, Pindar leaves his sting, as it were, in the mind of his reader. This is the characteristic which Theocritus emulates in the close of the poem we are now considering. "I think I utter a word not to be rejected by future generations. But virtue thou shalt seek from Zeus." Such a reproduction of the very spirit of Pindar's style is even more significant than any mere coincidences of language, or even of thought.

We have thus seen that in his sixteenth and seventeenth poems, Theocritus shows unmistakable traces of the influence of Pindar. The other poems of Theocritus, so far as I have observed, do not reveal further facts of a similar kind. And since there is nothing in our scanty knowledge of the life of the gifted Alexandrian to indicate that the two poems were not written at approximately the same period, we are justified in assuming that these years—perhaps from 265 B.C.—were a time of close and devoted study of the earlier bard.

In closing, I wish to say a single word of the contrast between the two poets. Notwithstanding all the reminders of Pindar in these two poems, yet Pindar never could have written them. There is much in them that is absolutely un-Pindaric. I do not refer so much to the unquestioning assent which Theocritus gives to the prevailing deification of the Alexandrian sovereigns, though this would be impossible from the poet who addresses the older Hiero with the simple words $\delta \phi \lambda \epsilon$. Theocritus was the child of his age, and the deification of kings was the fashion of his time.

But we are specially struck with the utter absence of that spirit of haughty self-confidence which is so striking a trait in Pindar. The proud Aegeid could never have described his songs as returning dejected from the quest for patronage, and resting their patient heads on their cold knees in utter discouragement (16. 7 ff.). For Theocritus was a well-beloved court poet; Pindar was a "divine bard." Perhaps we love Theocritus none the less for the difference.

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

THE VEDIC PATH OF THE GODS AND THE ROMAN PONTIFEX

BY ROLAND G. KENT

G. Wissowa¹ says that the meaning of but few Roman priestly designations is clear, while most of them are obscure or "trotz durchsichtiger Wortbildung, in dem Grunde ihrer Bedeutung nicht recht fassbar." In this last category he sets *lupercal* and *pontifex*. Certainly, if lack of agreement upon the interpretation of the name is a criterion, *pontifex* is to be set among those of uncertain development of meaning; and so great is this uncertainty that many etymologists have not hesitated entirely to reject any connection with *pōns* 'bridge.'

The second element in *pontifex* is of course the verbal noun to *faciō*; the various etymologies proposed for the first element of the compound are:

1. *pōns* 'bridge,' in the following interpretations:

a) *pōns* 'bridge': hence *pontifex* 'bridge-maker': the *pōns sublicius*, for several centuries the only bridge over the Tiber at Rome, was under the supervision of the pontifices, who built it, repaired it, and performed certain sacrifices there.²

b) *pōns* 'path': while this meaning is not found in Latin, it is assured by Greek *πάτος*, Skt. *panthan-*, meaning 'path, way'; hence *pontifex* 'pathmaker,' as for processions.³ Isidore says *pontifex princeps sacerdotum est, quasi via sequentium*,⁴ but this is a Christian interpretation.

c) *pōns* in the same meaning: *pontifex* 'Pfadbereiter, der zum Pfade der Götter leitet.'⁵

¹ *Religion u. Kultus d. Römer*, in v. Müller, *Hdb. d. kl. Altertumswiss.*, V, 4, p. 413.

² Varro *LL.* v. 83; Dion. Hal. *AR.* ii. 73; Plut. *Numa* 9; Serv. *Ad Aen.* ii. 166; Bücheler, *Umbrica*, p. 152; Keller, *Lat. Volksetym. u. Verwandtes* (1891), pp. 337 f.; von Planta, *Gram. d. oskisch-umbrischen Dialekte*, I, 470; Ernout, *Élém. dial. du vocab. lat.*, p. 218; Platner, *Top. and Mon. of Anc. Rome*, p. 77.

³ Lange, *Röm. Altertümer*, I, 370 f.; G. Curtius, *Grundzüge d. griech. Etym.* (1879), p. 270.

⁴ Isidore, *Etym.*, viii. 12. 13.

⁵ Kuhn, *KZ.* IV (1855), 75-77; Vaniček, *Etym. Wörth. d. lat. Spr.* (1874), p. 87; *Gr.-Lat. etym. Wörth.*, I (1877), 383.

d) *pōns* 'pilotis des terramari': hence *pontificēs* 'pile-builders' for the villages of prehistoric times.¹

e) *pōns* 'way' from the *saepta*, at which the voting tablets were given up: hence *pontifex* 'maker of ways' for this purpose.²

II. *ponti-* to *potēns* 'able': hence *pontifex* 'he who is able to perform' the sacrifices.³

III. *ponti-* to the root *pū-* 'purify': hence *pontifex* 'maker of purifications, of expiatory sacrifices.'⁴

IV. *ponti-* = Oscan *pontis* 'five times': hence *pontifex* 'the one making the fifth,' that is, 'maker of calculations' for calendar purposes, or 'the Five Actors' in some ceremonial performance.⁵

V. *ponti-* = Greek *πέμψις* 'πομπή', procession': hence *pontifex* 'arranger of processions'; for even in imperial times the pontifices did take part in the processions.⁶

VI. *ponti-* 'piatio,' by an etymology to be discussed later: hence *pontifex* 'maker of purifications or of expiations.'⁷

VII. *ponti-* = **spondi-* 'Willenserklärung,' connected with *sponde* and *spondeō*, with the familiar variation in initial *s*:⁸ hence *pontifex* 'maker of vows' on behalf of others.⁹

These etymologies may be divided into three groups: (1) those taking *ponti-* as *pōns* 'bridge' in the sense of a bridge over a river; (2) those taking *ponti-* as *pōns* 'bridge,' but in some other application of the word; (3) those taking *ponti-* as distinct in etymology from *pōns* 'bridge.'

¹ Helbig, cited by Daremberg and Saglio, *Dict. d. antiq. gr. et rom.*, s.v. *pontifex*; an interpretation of *pōns* as "tribunal," attributed by Daremberg and Saglio, *op. cit.*, to Voigt and to Soltan, I am unable to trace.

² Netušil, *BPW*, XI (1891), 867 f.

³ Scaevola *ap.* Varro *LL.* v. 83; Plut. Numa 9; cf. Lucan i. 595, and Lydus *De mensibus* iii. 21.

⁴ Benary, *Die röm. Lautlehre*, I, 70; Döderlein, *Hdb. d. lat. Etym.*, s.v. *pontifex*; Röper, *Lucubrationum pontificalium primitiae*, p. 33, citing also Förstemann; Marquardt, *Röm. Staatsverw.*, III (1878), 227-30.

⁵ Pfund, *Altital. Rechtsaltertümer*, pp. 212 ff.; E. Pais, *ap.* Daremberg and Saglio, *op. cit.*

⁶ Nazari, *Atti della R. Accad. delle Scienze di Torino*, XLIII (1907-8), 839-43; and *Riv. di filologia*, XXXVI, 575 f.; similarly Götting, *Gesch. d. röm. Staatsverf.*, p. 173, and Ihne, *ap.* Daremberg and Saglio, *op. cit.*

⁷ Walde, *Lat. et. Wörtl.*, s.v.; Bezzenberger, *KZ*, XLII, 86 f.

⁸ Brugmann, *Gdr. d. vergl. Gram. d. idg. Spr.*, 1^a, § 818.2.

⁹ Döhring, *ALL*, XV, 221 f.

With reference to the first, the main argument in its favor is its obviousness, and this has drawn to its support more adherents than have maintained any other view. The ancients inclined to this because of the duties and sacrifices of the pontifices at the *pōns sublicius*.¹ Platner and Ernout² think that the extreme importance of the *pōns sublicius*, when it was the only bridge over the Tiber, would readily account for the application of the term *pontifex* to an order of priests. Keller³ accounts for its use merely as a manifestation of primitive and naïve ideas in religion, and gives as a parallel *flāmen* 'Feueranbläser'—an etymology, by the way, not even listed by Walde.⁴ But according to the tradition, a *pontifex* was instituted by Numa Pompilius,⁵ and the building of the *pōns sublicius* followed two reigns later, under Ancus Marcius.⁶ This sequence of events would preclude the connection of the name *pontifex* with the *pōns sublicius*; but after all, the record of that period is not historical, but pure myth. At the same time it suggests the danger of deriving the religious term *pontifex* from a specified bridge, the building of which could not precede a time when the Romans were strong enough not to worry greatly over a possible sudden attack from their Etruscan neighbors. Nettleship⁷ argues that the pontifices probably preceded the building of any bridges at Rome, but were nevertheless real 'bridge-builders': for the tribes in their southward migrations crossed numerous rivers. At first sight this is a strong and valid argument for this interpretation; but in reality, a migrating tribe is more likely to cross rivers by fords or on rafts, like the Helvetians on their way into Gaul,⁸ than by building anything that could be dignified by the name of bridge.

Netušil,⁹ in taking *ponti-* to refer to the ways of exit from the voting *saepta*, claims that the regular use of the adjective *sublicius* in the phrase *pōns sublicius* argues a previous use of *pōns* in another special connection; and that had the wooden bridge been the first

¹ To the references already given, add Varro *LL*. vii. 44; Dion. Hal. *AR*. i. 38; Plut. *Quaest. Rom.* 32 and 86; Ovid *Fasti* v. 621-60; Lydus *De mensibus* iii. 21; Röper, *op. cit.*, pp. 8-32.

² *Loc. cit.*

³ *Loc. cit.*

⁴ *Op. cit.*, s.v. *flāmen*.

⁵ Liv. i. 20.

⁶ *Ibid.*, 33.

⁷ *Lectures and Essays*, I, 27-29.

⁸ Caes. *BG*. i. 8; i. 12.

⁹ *Loc. cit.*

bridge, it would have been the *pōns* par excellence, while any later bridge would have had the distinguishing adjective—such as *lapideus*. But even the granting of the point hardly gives force to his interpretation of *pontifex*. The other interpretations of *ponti-* as *pōns* 'bridge' in varying shades of meaning likewise lack support, except that of pontifex as 'maker of the path of the gods,' which is reserved for discussion later.

Walde¹ explains *ponti-* as 'piatio,' connecting it with *quīnquāre* 'lustrare'² and identifying it with Umb. *puntes*³ of the *Tabulae Iguvinae* iii. 4, 9, 10. Tradition represents the *pontifex* as a Sabine institution, and it is easily possible that the initial *p* is the Oscan-Umbrian development of an original *q*⁴ or *k*⁵, which appear in pure Latin as *qu*.⁴ Walde, following Stolz⁵ in deriving *quīnquāre* from *quīnque*, admits the lack of any ritual connection for the numeral 5 in Roman practice, but in *T.I.* iii. 3–5, *hūntak vuke prumu pehātu*. | *Inuk uhturu urtes puntis* | *frater ustentuta*, which he interprets *cisternam aedis primum piatio*. *Tum auctorem ortis* "*pontibus*" *ostendunt*, he pronounces *urtes puntis* a repetition of the action of the first sentence, hence 'piatio, lustratio.' Bezenberger,⁶ while accepting Walde's interpretation, connects *ponti-* with Avestan *spōnta-*, OB. *spētū*, Lith. *szveñta-* 'holy,' Lith. *szveñtē* 'Fest,' *szvēntinti* 'weißen,' OB. *spēštenikū* 'sacerdos,' and *quīnquāre* with Lith. *szvankū-s* 'anständig.' But Nazari⁷ has called attention to the fact that this interpretation does not fit *puntes* in the other passages where it occurs: *T.I.* iii. 8–10, *Sakre, uem uhtur* | *teitu, puntes terkantur*. *Inumek sakre*, | *uem urtas puntes fratrum upetuta* 'hostiam, ovem auctor dicito, "pontes" suffragentur. Tunc hostiam, ovem surgentes "pontes" fratrum deligunt.' Evidently *puntes* means not 'piatio,' but some arrangement or groups of the *Fratres Atiedii*; Nazari suggests equation with Greek *πέμψις* 'πομπή, procession'; but a more obvious etymology interprets it as 'pentad, group of five,' identical with Skt. *pañkti-*. Oscan-Umbrian **pompe* 'quinque,'

¹ *Loc. cit.*

² Charis. 81. 22 K.

³ Cf. also Bücheler, *loc. cit.*

⁴ Sommer, *Hdb. d. lat. Laut- u. Formenlehre*, pp. 202 f.

⁵ *Hist. Gram. d. lat. Spr.*, I, 596.

⁶ *Loc. cit.*

⁷ *Loc. cit.*

appearing in Oscan *púmperiat*s ‘*quincuriis,’ *Púntiis* Πομπτιες ‘Quintius,’ *pontis* ‘quinquiens,’ Umbrian *pumpeřias* ‘*quincuriae,’ assures the phonetics of the form. This is the view of Buck¹ and of von Planta,² while Conway³ and Bücheler⁴ waver between this and a comital meaning of *pōns* ‘bridge’ (possibly ‘bridge-ful’ on the way to the voting urns?). As for *quīnquāre*, a more probable explanation than either of those already mentioned is that it is a *Rückbildung* from the festival name *Quīnquātrūs*, like *parentāre* ‘ein Totenopfer bringen,’ to *Parentālia* ‘Totenopfer.’⁵ The *Quīnquātrūs*, later called also *Quīnquātria*, fell on March 19–23, and the name means the ‘fifth dark day’⁶ as it came five days after the Ides or full moon; it was later extended to five days by a false feeling for the meaning of the word.

Walde’s etymology therefore falls for want of cogency. A ritual value for ‘five’ can hardly be found in Roman religion;⁷ as for the number of the pontifices, Cicero’s statement⁸ that they were at first five is contradicted by Livy,⁹ who says that originally one was appointed, and that in 300 B.C. their number was raised from four to nine.

Of the other interpretations of *pontifex*, those connecting it with *sponde* and *spondeō*, with the root *pū-*, and with *potēns* are difficult or impossible from the phonetic standpoint; and the last of these, connecting the word with *potēns*, was certainly not present to the mind of Festus¹⁰ when he said that of the four priests ranking above the *pontifex maximus* the *Rēx* reclined at banquets above the *pontifex* and the three others, because he, the *Rēx*, was *potentissimus*.

The insufficiency or impossibility of these etymologies is, I trust, apparent; and it seems remarkable that—at least in the literature accessible to the writer—Vaniček alone has followed up Kuhn’s¹¹

¹ *Grammar of Oscan and Umbrian*, p. 344.

² *Gram. d. oskisch-umbrischen Dial.*, I, 342.

³ *Ital. Dial.*, II, 650.

⁴ *Loc. cit.*

⁵ Walde, *op. cit.*, s.v.

⁶ Cf. Varro *LL.* vi. 14; Charis. 81. 20–23 K.

⁷ Despite Pfund, *loc. cit.*

⁸ *De rep.* ii. 14. 26.

⁹ i. 20; x. 6. 6. Whether or not the first pontifex was King Numa himself (cf. Ihne, *Early Rome*, p. 103) does not affect the argument.

¹⁰ Fest. 185 M; cf. also Röper, *op. cit.*, pp. 5–8.

¹¹ *Loc. cit.*

'Pfadbereiter.' The word *pōns* 'bridge' is an exact equivalent of OB. *patl* 'way,'¹ and with slight differences² in suffix and in the ablaut grade of the radical vowel corresponds to OPr. *pinti-s* 'way,' Skt. *path- pathī- pathiā- panthā- pānthān-* 'path, way,' *pāthas-* N. 'spot, place, water,'³ *pāthis-* N. 'sea,' Avestan *panti- paθ- paθi- paθā-* 'path, way,' Greek *πόντος* 'sea,' *πάτος* 'path,' *πατέω* 'I tread.' The original meaning of the word is evidently 'path, way'—more narrowly, as Meringer⁴ has shown, 'Prügelweg,' or 'corduroy road,' as such a road is called in America. The development of meaning to 'bridge,' as a 'path' across a river, to 'expanse of water,' as a 'path' for ships (cf. the Homeric *ἵγρὰ κέλευθα*⁵) and to 'place,' as 'paths' collectively, is easy.

In the *Rigveda*, the words *panthā-*, *pathiā-*, etc., 'path, way,' are used some 175 times; in addition to the literal meaning of an actual road on earth, trodden by human beings, they often denote the way between this world and the next. For example, the 'path' is the way by which the offering reaches the gods:⁶

RV. i. 41. 5: *yañ yajñān náyathā nara*
ādityā rjūnā pathā
prā vañ sá dhātaye naçat

What sacrifice ye conduct, O men,—
O Ādityas, by the straight *path*
That reaches your hearts.

Of the path for the hymn to reach the gods, we have:

RV. ix. 9. 8; *nū nāvyaṣe nāvīyaṣe*
sūktāya sādhaṣā pathāḥ

Now for a newer, newer
Hymn, prepare the *paths*.

¹ Unless direct equation with *πόντος* be preferred, in which case *pōns* has syncope of *o* rather than of *i*; cf. Ciardi-Dupré, *BB*, XXVI, 222.

² Whether the aspiration seen in Indo-Iranian is original or secondary is of no consequence for the present purpose.

³ In certain compounds listed by Monier-Williams, *Sanskrit-English Dict.*, p. 617, col. 1, s.v. *pāthas-*, *pātho-*; cf. also *pātha-*.

⁴ *Wörter und Sachen*, I, 192-99.

⁵ *Il.* i. 312; *Od.* iii. 71; iv. 842; ix. 252; xv. 474.

⁶ Similarly, in connection with the sacrifice: i. 46. 11; i. 79. 3; i. 162. 21; vi. 44. 8; ix. 73. 6; ix. 86. 33; ix. 95. 2; ix. 97. 32; x. 31. 2. The paths in reference to the *Soma* are usually of the flowing of the juice from the pressing-stones: ix. 15. 3; ix. 86. 16; ix. 89. 1; ix. 101. 6; ix. 106. 6.

It indicates the path of Agni, the fire of the sacrifice, to the gods:

RV. i. 58. 1: *nū cit sahojā amfto nī tundate*
hōtā yād dātō ābhavad vivāsvataḥ
vī sddhiṣṭhebhīḥ pathībhiḥ rājo mama
ā devātāḥ haviṣā vivāsati
 Now the mighty deathless one doth make his way,
 Since he is Vivasvant's priest and messenger;
 On straightest *paths* he traverses the air;
 The deities he honors with oblation.

Then upon these "paths" Agni is to bring down the gods to be present at the sacrifice:¹

RV. v. 1. 11: *ādyā rātham bhānumo bhānumāntam*
āgne tṣṭha yajalēbhīḥ sāmāntam
vidvān pathānām urō āntārikṣam
ēhā devān havirādyāya vakṣi

Today, O radiant Agni, mount thy radiant car, together with the deities,
 And knowing well the *paths*, through the wide atmosphere, bring hither the
 gods to the sacrificial meal.

The word denotes the path from the world of the living to the world
 of the dead, which Yama was the first to traverse, and which all men
 must some day tread:²

RV. x. 14. 1: *pareyivānsam pravāto mahīr ānu*
bahūbhyaḥ pānthām anupaspaṣānām
vaiśvasvatām saṁgamanaṁ jānānām
yamām rājānām haviṣā duvāsyā
 Him who has gone to the mighty heights,
 Who has shown the *path* to many,
 Vivasvant's son, the gatherer of men,
 King Yama, honor with oblation.

RV. x. 14. 2: *yamō no gātūm prathamō viveda*
naṣṭā gāvītīr āpabhartavā u
yātrā naḥ pūrve pitāraḥ pareyūr
enā jajñāndh pathyā ānu svāḥ
 Yama was the first to find the way,
 And this way is not to be avoided;
 Where our ancestors have gone before us,
 By this *path* their children shall go.

¹ Cf. vii. 39. 3.

² Cf. also RV. i. 38. 5; vi. 53. 1 and 4; viii. 30. 3; x. 17. 6; x. 18. 1.

RV. x. 14. 7: *prēhi prēhi pathībhiḥ pūrvyēbhir*
yātrā naḥ pūrve pitāraḥ pareyūḥ
ubhā rājānā svadhāyā mādanti
yamām paçyāsi vāruṇām ca devām
 Go forth, go forth by the ancient *paths*,
 By which our ancestors have gone before us;
 The two kings reveling in happiness,
 Yama and God Varuna, shalt thou see.

RV. x. 14. 10: *āti drava sārameyaṁ çvānau*
caturakṣaṁ çabālau sādhanā pathā
āthā piṭṛn suvidātrāṇ īpehi
yamēna yé sadhamādam mādanti
 Run past the two dogs of Saramā,
 Four-eyed and brindled, by the straight *path*;
 Then go unto the bounteous Manes,
 Who revel at the feast with Yama.

In the Avesta, also, this word is used of the path to the home of the blest after death:

Yasna 43. 3: <i>aṭ hō vaoḥōuš</i>	<i>vahyō nā aibi.ḡamyāt</i>
<i>yō nā arəzūš</i>	<i>savaḥō paθō sīšōit</i>
<i>ahyā aḥōuš</i>	<i>astvatō manaḥhasčā</i>
<i>haiθyēng ā stīš</i>	<i>yēng ā.šāēitī ahurō</i>
<i>arədrō θwāvqs</i>	<i>huzəntuša spəntō mazdā</i>

But may he [Zarathushtra] attain to <what is> better than the good,
 Who may teach us the straight *paths* of profit
 Of this bodily life and of the mind,
 The true <paths> unto the beings with whom Ahura abides,—
 He [Zarathushtra] faithful, wise, bounteous, like thee, O Mazdāh.

Yasna 50. 4: <i>aṭ vā yazāi</i>	<i>stavas mazdā ahurā</i>
<i>hadā ašā</i>	<i>vahištāčā manamhā</i>
<i>xšaθrāčā yā</i>	<i>išō stāḡhaṭ ā paiθi</i>
<i>ākā arədrēng</i>	<i>dənānē garō sərəošanē</i>

And you I pray to with praise, O Mazdāh Ahura,
 Along with Asha and Vahishta Manah
 And Khshathra, that ye, the desired ones, may stand by the *path*,
 As revealers unto the pious, <by the path> to the Home of
 Song for the obedient man.

The word *panthā*-, in its various forms, thus means any kind of path, physical or figurative, on earth or in air; and in religious literature it is often applied to the way from the home of men to the

abode of the gods and of the dead. Is it not likely, then, that the *pontifex* is the one *qui pontēs facit* 'who makes or keeps in order the paths' between this world and the next? Curiously, a compound of the same meaning, *pathikft* 'path-making, way-preparing,' occurs several times in the *Rigveda*, where *gopdḥ pathikfd* 'path-making protector,' applied to Brhaspati, is found; also *puratd . . . pathikfd* 'path-making guide,' applied to Indra, and *ṣṣibhyaḥ . . . pathikfdbhyaḥ* 'path-making rishis.'¹ This interpretation of *pontifex* accords perfectly with the fact that the pontifices had oversight of the whole religious machinery of the state, with the duty of seeing that both priests and laity observed the established procedure.²

The importance of keeping in order the paths between this world and the next is evident: the sacrifice must travel on the paths to the gods—if it should not arrive, the gods would be angered and vent their displeasure upon the men; the gods must have an easy pathway to earth, when they wish to visit the world; and above all, the path to the home of the dead must be kept in good order, for we must all traverse it some day, and we must appease the souls of our ancestors with offerings, or we shall be received most unpleasantly on our arrival among them.

It is for these reasons that I see in the *pontifex* one who makes or keeps in order the paths between this world and the next. The development of *pōns* as a separate word, from the meaning 'path' to that of 'bridge,' gives rise to two remarks. First, the idea of a bridge that must be traversed on the way to the abode of the dead appears in a number of religions. The Greeks, it is true, imagined a ferryman Charon who set the ghosts across the River Styx in a boat; but the Norse legends speak of a golden bridge across the River Gjoll to the abode of the goddess Hel;³ the spirit of the Zoroastrian traversed the *činvatō peretuš*⁴ or 'Bridge of the Separator,' which narrowed until the spirit of the evil man fell off into the place of punishment, while it broadened and gave to the spirit of the righteous man a safe and easy passage to Paradise. In the *Rigveda* also we

¹RV. ii. 23. 6; vi. 21. 12; x. 14. 15; cf. also ix. 106. 5; x. 111. 3; and Kuhn, *loc. cit.*

² Liv. i. 20; Cic. *Har. Resp.* 7; Dion. Hal. *A.R.* ii. 73; Ihne, *Early Rome*, pp. 118 f.

³ Golther, *Handbuch der germanischen Mythologie*, p. 473.

⁴ *Yasna* 46. 10–11; 51. 13; Jackson, *Die iranische Religion*, § 83.

find mention of a figurative bridge that forms the pathway of the rightly acting man:

RV. ix. 41. 2: *suritāśya manāmahē 'ti sētuṃ durāvyaṃ*
sāhvāṇso dāsyum avratām

We strive to traverse the difficult bridge of Welfare,
 Overpowering the irreligious foe.

Secondly, the name *pontifex*, though having the meaning which has here been attributed to it, might readily be associated with bridges when *pōns* had acquired that meaning in early Latin, and might by an easy popular etymology cause the holder of the title to be intrusted not only with sacrifices at bridges, but also with the construction and the repair of the bridges. In this case, it is easy to see why many Roman etymologists believed that the *pontifex* was so called because of certain duties connected with bridges: the truth may well be the reverse, that the functions came from the name.

SUMMARY

Comparison with the religious beliefs of other Indo-European peoples, and especially with the religious significance of the cognates of Latin *pōns* suggest that the *pontifex* was the one who made or kept in order the *pontēs* or 'paths' between the world of the living and the world of the gods and of the dead. If this be so, a popular etymology when *pōns* in early Latin meant no longer 'path,' but 'bridge,' may have caused the assignment to the pontifices of various functions connected with bridges—and this led the Roman etymologists to a misinterpretation of the word.

UNIVERSITY OF PENNSYLVANIA

PROPERTIANA

By J. P. POSTGATE

The appearance of a text and translation of Propertius in Mr. Loeb's Anglo-American Series has suggested the publication of the following notes upon books III and IV.

III. iv. 9 f.:

omina fausta cano. Crassos clademque piate,	(10)
ite et Romanae consulite historiae.	
ipsa tuam prolem serua, Venus; hoc sit in aeuum,	(19)
cernis ab Aenea quod superesse caput	(20)
Mars pater et sacrae fatalia lumina Vestae,	
ante meos obitus sit, precor, illa dies	
qua uideam e.q.s.	

Editors, at least some of them, are aware that *sacra Vesta* is an improper expression, applying to a deity an epithet which means consecrated to a deity. But, except Heinsius' *Latiae*, I know of no proposal to change it. Mr. Butler, with others, translates 'holy Vesta,' for which the Latin is 'sanctae Vestae.' And this I restore, comparing Claudian *Bell. Gild.* 1. 128 ff., 'mater Cytherea parensque | flet Mauors *sanctaeque* memor, Tritonia *Vestae*, | nec Cybele sicco nec stabat lumine Iuno,' where the effect of a pitiful appeal by Rome to her tutelary gods is described.

I have given the verses their proper context, placing before them 19, 20 of the vulgate, in which the third of the tutelary deities is implored to preserve the patriot leader in his perilous expedition. The vulgate order interposes the couplet between the enumerations of the spoils of victory as they move in procession (13-18) and their summing up as *praeda haec* (21), and it makes the poet appeal to Venus to save her descendant *at the moment of his triumph*. But these considerations were naught to the criticaster who, seeking a place for the strayed distich, was caught by the correspondence, as he deemed it, of *hoc sit . . . caput* and *praeda sit haec*.

III. v. 15 f.

uictor cum uictis pariter miscebitur umbris;
consule cum Mario, capte Jugurtha, sedes.

The text of 15 has been felt by many to be unsatisfactory, though it is hard to demonstrate absolutely that it is impossible. My present object is to say a word in defense of my own suggestion, *uictrix* for *uictor*. I should cite in favor of it Martial 6. 76. 6, 'et famulum *uictrix* possidet *umbra* nemus'; Ovid *Trist.* iii. 3. 63, 'inter *Sarmaticas Romana* uagabitur *umbras*' (where *Romana* would correspond to *uictrix* here), and above all Seneca *Agam.* 789 ff., '*haec hodie ratis* (cf. Prop. v. 14) | Phlegethontis atri regias animas uehet | *uictamque uictricemque*.' I imagine that what induced the corruption was the writing 'uict'x' which first became *uictis* and from that was very naturally altered to *uictor*.

III. xiii. 59 ff.:

Proloquar (atque utinam patriae sim uerus haruspex)
frangitur ipsa suis Roma superba bonis. (60)
certa loquor sed nulla fides: neque enim Ilia quondam
uerax Pergameis maenas habenda malis.
sola Parim Phrygiae fatum componere, sola
fallacem patriae serpere dixit equum.
ille furor patriae fuit utilis, ille parenti: (65)
experta est ueros irrita lingua deos.

In 59 our Cassandra-Propertius utters a hope which he despairs of realizing. This hope may be one of two, either that his countrymen will heed him before it is too late, or that his prophecy of Rome's downfall will be falsified. For neither view is the context in itself decisive. The first would connect the thought with *sed nulla fides*; the second with *certa loquor*. But the first 'may my country regard¹ me as a true seer' keeps the reading of the MSS on which we have to base our text and has the countenance of viii. 17 f., 'his ego tormentis animi sum uerus haruspex, | has didici certo saepe in amore notas,' while the *uanus*, 'may my country find me a false seer,' which I adopted in my Corpus text, may be nothing more than a conjecture of the Itali.

Mr. Butler translates 61 f.:

I speak sure truth, but none believe me; for neither was the frenzied maid of Ilium ever to be deemed a true seer among the woes of Troy.

Mr. Butler thus construes through a tower of Danae, but less puissant mortals would be glad to find an adit, by way of proof

¹ Mr. Butler ambiguously translates 'find me a true seer.'

furnished that the substantive verb can be left out in such a case, and that *habendus* can be wrenched till it stands in the place of *habitus*. For the only sense of '*neque enim uerax erat habenda*' known to normal Latinity is 'and she ought not to have been deemed true.'

The lines present the critic with a double problem. A proper meaning, 'Cassandra was not believed,' must be provided and a grammatical construction. Schrader's '*nec credita quondam*' is the only conjecture known to me that would provide them; but it is paleographically incredible. I must therefore adhere to my own emendation with a slight alteration that I trust will make it more acceptable. I would now read '*neque enim, a tibi quondam, | uerax Pergameis, Maenas, habenda malis.*' The corruption arose through a misreading of *t*ⁱ (the abbreviation of *tibi*) and the displacement of *a*. The *lia* thus engendered was easily transformed into the *ilia* which the context suggested. Propertius says, 'What I say is sure; but there is no credence. Neither, alas, didst thou, frenzied maid, have any formerly who wast to be deemed a true seer through (in) the woes of Troy.' Your carmina were 'sero rata,' as he says elsewhere, iv. 1. 51. *tibi*, sc. *fides erat*, with an easy ellipse. *Ilia*, which some may miss, is not necessary to *Maenas* as *Pergameis* has just preceded; compare Ovid *Am.* i. 9. 37 f. and Seneca *Agam.* 756.

In the next line I should not now change *fuit utilis*, for which not 'profuit' but 'prodesse potuit' is the equivalent. But, as the Loeb translation does not make the meaning of Propertius clear, I will endeavor to do so. 'Cassandra's prophetic frenzy would have been of service to her country and her sire; but her tongue (voice) was set at naught and discovered (experienced) that a god's word is true.' The god is of course Apollo, who, unable to revoke his gift of inspiration, punished the breach of promise by decreeing that the seeress should never be believed. For *experta est* we may compare Ovid *Trist.* iii. 2. 27; Juv. 13. 102 f.: 'sed et exorabile numen | fortasse experiar.' The allusion is similar in the taunting phrase of *Agam.* 256, 'famula ueridici dei.'

III. xvi. 9 f.:

peccaram semel et totum sum pulsus in annum:
in me mansuetas non habet illa manus.

It is usual to retain *sum pulsus* and explain as 'I was banished'; but Palmer on Plautus *Amphitr.* ii. 1. 61 proposed 'optusus' (N having 'portus') in the sense of 'beaten' or 'mauled.' The emendation has gained no adherents, although it would make our pentameter more relevant to the hexameter. It may seem, however, possible that *pulsus*, by whomsoever written, was intended to have the sense of *pulsatus* when we compare the alternation of the two verbs in Ter. *Ad.* 637, 638, 'quis hic ostium *pultaui*? . . . tune has *pepulisti* fores?' and *ibid.* 788, 'quisnam a me *pepulit* tam grauitur fores?' That for Propertius there was no sharp line of severance between *pello* and *pulso* is shown by III. i. 25, 'equo *pulsas* abiegno . . . arces,' compared with IV. x. 33, 'aries murum cornu *pulsabat* aheni,' and we know from IV. viii. 57-70 how free Cynthia was with her hands.

III. xix. 15 ff.:

crimen et illa fuit patria succensa senecta (15)

arboris in frondes condita Myrrha nouae. (16)

tuque, o, Minoa uenundata, Scylla, figura (21)

tondens purpuream, regna paterna, comam. (22)

Mr. Butler reads '*tondes* (Keil) *purpurea regna paterna coma*' in 22 and repeats the common misunderstanding of *uenundata* in 21. He translates:

And thou, Scylla, that didst sell thyself for the beauty of Minos, thou didst shear away thy father's realm when thou shorest his purple lock.

But Scylla did not sell herself, and for a very good reason. There were no buyers. What she did sell was her father's life and kingdom; and *uenundata* is neuter plural. This should be clear from Ovid *Met.* 8. 90 ff., 'proles ego regia Nisi | Scylla tibi trado patriaeque (*better patriosque*) meosque penates. | praemia nulla peto nisi te' (=figura tua uenundo). cape pignus amoris | *purpureum crinem nec me nunc tradere crinem | sed patrium tibi crede caput.*' In the words that I have placed in italics Ovid expresses characteristically the equation of values which in Markland's *purpuream comam* is restored to Propertius. Finally, by importing *tondes* we obtain an abrupt and disconcerting historical present and lose a

very elegant descriptive participle with which we may compare Vergil's 'uel te sulco, Serrane, *serentem*,' *Aen.* 6. 844. And quite needlessly, if we place 15-16 where they should be, as 'tuque' is then at once understood as 'tuque crimen fuisti.'

IV. iii. 7 ff.:

te modo uiderunt iteratos Bactra per ortus†
te modo† *munitus hericus*† hostis equo
Hibernique Getae pictoque Britannia curru
†ustus† et Eoa decolor Indus aqua.

Every attempt to explain or defend *iteratos* *ortus* has proved a dismal failure. Of corrections Mr. Housman's *arcus* is relevant and probable. His *Ituraeos uiderunt* postulates too much and does not, moreover, touch a difficulty that I have always felt about the passage, however read—the uncomfortable detachment of *per* and its noun from the main construction. This will disappear if *ire* lurks in *iteratos*. For the expression *ire per* compare, inter alios, Val. Fl. 1. 438, 'tu medios gladio bonus *ire per* hostes,' and Propertius himself (cited below). After *ire* we may next disinter *acris*; cf. Verg. *Aen.* 9. 665, 'intendunt *acris arcus*' (of a real fight), and *ibid.*, 7. 164, 'aut *acris tendunt arcus*' (of a sham one). The best commentary on *acris* is Plutarch *Crass.* 24, εὐτόνους τὰς πλεγάς καὶ βιατοὺς δίδόντες ἀπὸ τόξων κραταίων καὶ μεγάλων. We should thus get a close parallel to III. ix. 25, 'uel tibi (liceat) Medorum *pugnaces ire per hastas*' (*hastas* Markland, *hostes* the MSS), where the reference is to the *conti* of the *cataphracti*; cf. Amm. Marc. 25. 3. 4 and Plutarch *Crass.*, *loc. cit.* Wrong division and conjunction of words is a recognized form of corruption in the MSS of Propertius; see, e.g., II. xxxii. 5 (N); IV. vii. 61.

In the following pentameter recent editions are divided between *munito Sericus* (Beroaldus) and *munito Neuricus* (Jacob). The first is nearer to the tradition *munitus hericus*; and, although the *Sarmatae* were notable for their *cataphracti* (cf. the account in Tac. *H.* 1. 79), this proves nothing for the *Neuri*, whose only recorded distinction, disbelieved by the Father of History, was that each of them turned once a year into a wolf (Herod. 4. 105, Mela 2. 1. 14). *Sericus* has been challenged on the grounds that the *Seres* were never enemies of Rome (though Horace c. iii. 29. 27 and iv. 15. 23 couples

them with the Parthians and i. 12. 56 with the Indi), that they were *molles* and had no cataphracts. The only answer to the last objection is that Propertius is thinking of the Parthians as perhaps Horace is in i. 29. 9, 'doctus sagittas tendere Sericas | arcu paterno.' If this is not satisfactory, *ferreus* would not be far from the MSS as *f* and *f* are perpetually confused; cf. III. xii. 11 f., 'neue tua Medae laetentur caede sagittae, | *ferreus* aurato¹ neu cataphractus equo,' and the '*ferreus equitatus*' of Ammianus 19. 1. 2.

From 54 B.C. for all but a hundred years no Roman force entered our island, although it would appear that on two occasions (in 34 and 27) Augustus had projected an invasion. But this glaring disregard of fact is not the sole blemish in the three words *picto Britannia curru*. The bodies of the ancient Britons were tattooed, not their chariots, which were scythed; nor may *picto* be equated to *caelato* just to gain some support from the fashionable copies of the British *essedae*, II. i. 76, '*essedae caelatis siste Britannia iugis*.' A very different locality is suggested by the contemporary history and the context ('hiberni Getae'; cf. Mela ii. 2. 18)—the troublous country of Thrace. A district of this 'horse-rearing' land (Hes. *Op.* 507) we know from Herodotus 7. 108 was called *Βριαντιχή*. And if Propertius wrote here Briantia, who can doubt what it would become?

In the last line *ustus* is apparently a gloss on *decolor* (which Mr. Butler translates though his text has the meaningless *discolor*) as Dr. P. J. Enk supposes (*ad Propertii Carmina*, p. 307). If so, the word it has ousted need not necessarily have resembled it. His own '*accola et Eoae . . . aquae*' is, however, open to the objection that it involves a further change. The difficulty he finds in Mr. Housman's *tunsus*, which I formerly accepted, '*de gente dictum minus uerisimile uidetur*' is a reasonable one; and I would now offer *tinctus*, which is directly suggested by Ovid *Met.* 4. 21, '*decolor extremo qua tingitur India Gange*' (where *d. India* = *decolores Indi*). *decolor* and *tinctus* are joined again at *Pont.* iii. 2. 54, '(ara) *decolor*

¹ Mr. Butler misunderstands this. The *auratus equus* is the Roman officer's richly caparisoned horse in which, as the balanced structure of the sentences itself shows, the iron-mailed soldier takes a captor's delight; cf. for the gorgeous equipment of the Roman Tib. i. 2. 69 f., 'totus et argento contextus totus et auro | insideat celeri conspiciendus equo,' and for the thought Horace c. iii. 6. 11 f., '(Monaeses et Pacori manus) adiecisse praedam | torquibus exiguis renidet.'

adfuso *tincla* cruore rubet.' And Propertius himself has the participle at III. xi. 18, 'Gygaeo *tincla* puella lacu.'

IV. iv. 75 f.

annua pastorum conuiuia, lusus in urbe
cum pagana madent fercula *diuitiis*.

Mr. Butler repeats the version of his commentary, 'when the country platters are moistened with *rich fare*.' This is an excellent example of the 'translating fallacy.' Because *diues* in certain senses can be rendered by 'rich' in English, it is assumed that to give it so in all cases 'presents no real difficulty.' The Latin for 'rich' in the sense required is *opimus* and never *diues*; Ausonius *Epist.* 5. 18 does not count. And even in English you cannot apply 'riches' to food. *deliciis* is perhaps possible, but hardly appropriate; and, moreover, it does not readily account for the corruption. The true word is not difficult to find if we notice the last syllable of *fercula*. A following *la* would have been the easiest of losses, and when the first two letters of *lautitiis* were lost, would *utitiis* suggest anything to a scribe but *uitiis*, the last three syllables of <di> *uitiis*? *lautus* of good feeding ('lautissima cena' Juvenal) needs no illustration; but I may cite Petronius (e.g., 57, 70) for *lautitiae* used just as it is here.

An interesting case of a gap caused by 'homoigraphon' and subsequently filled with a meaningless substitute is III. xxi. 28, 'tuos, *docte* Menandre sales' where, as Kuinoel restored to Propertius from IV. v. 43 '*mundi* Thais pretiosa *Menandri*,' we must without hesitation replace the intruder *docte* by *munde*, its loss being due to its similarity to the following *menand*°.

THE UNIVERSITY OF LIVERPOOL
March 22, 1913

STUDIES IN GREEK NOUN-FORMATION

Based in part upon material collected by the late A. W. STRATTON, and prepared under the supervision of CARL D. BUCK¹

LABIAL TERMINATIONS IV

Words in -ψ

By E. H. STURTEVANT

Most of the Greek words in -ψ are monosyllabic root-nouns, such as φλέψ, ὄψ, κλώψ, νίφα, and their compounds. Several of them show the characteristic lengthened grade; e.g., ὠψ, -βλωψ, κλώψ. Particularly numerous and important are the compounds in -οψ and -ωψ, which have been discussed in connection with those in -οπος, -ωπος, in CP. VII. 421-33.

Of the remaining words in our lists an unusually large proportion occur only in a single author or are known only through the grammarians and lexicographers. Many of these are doubtful in meaning and most of them are of uncertain etymology. In several cases borrowing from some foreign language is certain, and in others it is more or less probable. There can be no doubt about such words as Ἄραβες, Χάλυβες, or the hybrid Μιγδί-λνψ. Scarcely less clear is Κεντόριπες, the "ἔθνικόν" of Κεντόριπα in Sicily.

Two of our words occur in a curious passage in Clement of Alexandria, which runs as follows (3. 38 Dind.): Ἀπολλόδωρος δ' ὁ Κερκυραῖος τοὺς στίχους τοῦσδε ὑπὸ Βράγχου ἀναφωνηθῆναι τοῦ μάντεως λέγει Μιλησίους καθαίροντος ἀπὸ λοιμοῦ. ὁ μὲν γὰρ ἐπιρραίνων τὸ πλήθος δάφνης κλάδοις προκατήρχετο τοῦ ὕμνου ὧδέ πως

μέλπετε, ὦ παῖδες, ἐκάεργον καὶ ἐκαέργαν.

ἐπέφαλλεν δὲ ὡς εἰπεῖν ὁ λαὸς "βέδν ζάμφ χθὼ πλῆκτρον σφίγξ, κναξζβι χθύπτῃς φλεγμῶ δρόψ."

Since Bentley (*Epist. ad Millium* 47 ff.) pointed out that this mystic formula contained just two complete alphabets, no one has expected to find in it any very important meaning. We need not, however, conclude that it consists of nonsense syllables; on the contrary, πλῆκτρον and σφίγξ are familiar, and βέδν is known to be

¹ See Introductory Note, CP. V. 323 ff.

a Thracio-Phrygian word for "water" (see Tomaschek *Sitzungsberichte der Wiener Akad.* 130. 2. 5; Kretschmer, *Einleitung* 239). *δρόψ* also seems to be a real word although a bit uncertain both in form and in meaning. The recorded spelling in Clement is *δρώνψ*, although *ο* instead of *ω* is needed to complete the alphabet, and he defines the word as follows (3. 39 Dind.): *δρώνψ δὲ ὁ λόγος ὁ δραστήριος ὁ ἐκ κατηχίσεως τῆς πρώτης εἰς αὐξήσιν ἀνδρὸς εἰς μέτρον ἡλικίας, ἐκφλέγων καὶ ἐκφωτίζων τὸν ἄνθρωπον*. Porphyry (ap. Bentley *loc. cit.*), in a discussion of the latter half of our formula, remarks: *δρόψ δὲ ἄνθρωπος· δρώπες γὰρ οἱ ἄνθρωποι λέγονται*. Finally, we have the Hesychian gloss, *δρώνψ· ἄνθρωπος*. The stem appears occasionally in personal names in central and northern Greece including Macedonia: e.g., *Δρώπος*, *Δρωπίδης*, *Δρωπίνας*, *Δρωπύλος*, *Δρωπώνδας* (see references in Hoffmann *Maked.* 183).

If we could be sure that Porphyry and Hesychius were independent witnesses we should, of course, assume that their definition was the correct one. But Porphyry's remark reads like a citation from a lexicon, and if its source is really such, it probably depends ultimately on the same authority as Hesychius' gloss. In fact it is altogether likely that Porphyry is quoting Diogenianus, of whose work Hesychius' lexicon is, in the main, an abridgment. If so, Porphyry's citation of the word in the plural indicates that it had that number in Diogenianus, and consequently in the author from whom it was originally taken. The substitution of the singular by Hesychius or some copyist requires no comment.

On the other hand, Clement's definition does not inspire confidence, especially in view of the fact that it is preceded by a definition of the impossible word *κναξζβί*. It may have, as Professor Buck suggests by letter, no other basis than a fanciful etymology from *ὄψ* and *δρᾶν* (cf. Clement's phrase, *ὁ λόγος ὁ δραστήριος*). The only certain inference we can draw from Clement's discussion is that the meaning "*ἄνθρωπος*" was unknown to him.

If the definition of *δρόψ* by *ἄνθρωπος* is correct, no doubt the two words are etymologically related.¹ M. Schmidt, on Hesych. s.v., suggested that the *δ* of *δρόψ* may point to Macedonian origin.

¹ If we regard them as from **νρ-ωπ-* and **δνρ-ωπ-* respectively (Curtius), the *θ* of *ἀνθρωπος* makes difficulty. Brugmann's (*IF.* 12. 25 ff.) derivation of *ἀνθρωπος* from *δνρ-* (> *ἀνδρ-*) + *ωπ-* (: *ἐν-έπω*, *ἔσπερε*, etc.) is not satisfactory, since the

But since the Greek names in *δρωπ-* are not confined to Macedon we should rather assume that the word was common to Macedonian and Thracian (cf. Thracian *βέδν* in Clement's formula), and was carried into central Greece by the Thracian settlers in Phocis and Boeotia.¹ Since both languages have *d* for Indo-European *dh*, one may think of *δρῶψ* as an inherited form in both. The etymology remains obscure.

The well-known tendency of the Greeks to assimilate loan words to the inherited elements of their language (cf., most recently, Fick *Hattiden und Danubier* 1) is several times illustrated by the words in *-ψ*. Aelian writes *μόνωψ* for Paeonian *μόναπος* (see CP. VII. 424). Possibly *ἐλ(λ)οψ* beside *ἐλαψ* is to be explained similarly (but cf. CP. VII. 424). *αἰγ-ίλωψ* beside Macedonian *ἰλεξ* has been discussed in CP. VII. 426. If Lesný, KZ. 42. 297 f., is right in connecting *γῶπας· κολοιούς*, Hesych., with *γύψ* "vulture," the *ω* is due to the analogy of words in *-ωψ* rather than to any phonological process (cf. Kretschmer *Glotta* 3. 307). *πρίοπες· τὰ ὑγιῆ ἔχοντα*, Hesych., may be connected with Thraco-Phrygian *Πρίαπος* in a similar way. For the loan words *γρύψ* and *πῶλνψ* see CP. VI. 200 and VII. 434 respectively.

One such case is exceptional in that the effort to introduce the modified form was perfectly self-conscious, and, for that very reason, only partially successful. *Ῥύπες*, the name of a very ancient city in Achaea, and of its inhabitants, has recently received illuminating treatment by Fick, KZ. 42. 295 ff. He considers it a Messapian word, and compares Lithuanian *rupas* "rough, rugged," Lettic *rupjsch* "coarse, hard," Lat. *rupes* (: *rumpo*). The Arcadian neighbors of the city, however, found no difficulty in fitting the name out with a Greek etymology. They connected it with *ρύπος*, "dirt," *ρύπαρός*, etc., and were so pleased with the implication that they called all Achaeans *Ῥύπες* (*Ῥύπας· τοὺς ἐν τῇ Ἀρκαδίᾳ Ἀχαιοὺς*, Hesych.). The gibe struck home, and the townspeople and their friends tried to change the offensive name, as we learn from Pher-

required meaning of the root does not occur in Greek, and the development of *-δρ-* to *-θρ-* is dubious. Still less satisfactory are the etymologies proposed by Fay PAPA. 25. vii and AJP. 27. 312 ff.

¹ On these see Fick *Vorgriechische Ortsnamen* 122 f. and *Hattiden und Danubier in Griechenland* 26 ff.

cydes of Athens fr. 114 = *E.M.* 150. 55: "Αρυπες, Φερεκύδης, ἀντὶ τοῦ Ρύπες. . . 'Ρύπες γὰρ λέγονται οἱ 'Αχαιοί. . . Probably the notices in Steph. B., s.v. 'Αρύπη, and Theognostus in Cram *An. Ox.* 2. 98 derive from the same passage. Theognostus' remarks are worth quoting: "Α-ρυψ· οἱ ἀπὸ δύσεως μέχρι 'Ισθμοῦ 'Αχαιοί τοῦτο δὲ καὶ μονοσυλλάβως λέγεται παρὰ τοῖς 'Ελλησιν· 'Ρὺψ γὰρ παρ' αὐτοῖς εἴρηται. The personal name "Αροπος, *IG.* 2. 1617, is probably a further modification of "Αρυψ under the influence of the personal names in -οπος, while 'Ρόπιος, *IG.* 7. 3667, seems to imply a name *Ρόψ or *Ρόπος, which would stand in a similar relation to 'Ρύψ (otherwise Fick-Bechtel 248).

Hesychius' γέργυπες νεκροί clearly contains the base of γοργός "terrible," Γοργώ, etc. The connection of the latter words with the dead was recognized by Roscher *Die Gorgonen* 28 ff. To the same group belongs Hesychius' γάργα, a name of the black poplar, the tree of death. γέργυρ¹ means "an underground drain" in Aleman 132 Bgk.⁴ and "dungeon" in Herodotus 3. 145. An equivalent γόργυρα is cited without reference (*E.M.* 238. 42 f.; *A.B.* 233. 25 ff.). Both meanings were probably developed from some such force as "grave" or "subterranean dwelling of the dead." The original connection of the word with the world below is apparent from the name of Γόργυρα, mother by Acheron of Ascalaphus, who spied upon Core in the interest of Pluto (Apollodorus 1. 5. 3).

Γόργυρα occurs also as a geographical name in Stephanus of Byzantium: Γόργυρα· τόπος ἐν Σάμῳ, ὡς ἱστορεῖ Δοῦρις, ἐν ᾧ Διόνυσος Γοργυρεὺς τιμᾶται. With this notice is to be compared *E.M.* 238. 40: Γόργυρος· ὁ Διόνυσος, ἀπὸ Γοργύρας τόπου τῆς Σάμου. The spot was originally a ἡρώων sacred to Γόργυρος. Dionysus very likely came to be identified with him on account of his position as patron of tragedy. In other words, we should assume a development similar to that by which the tragic performances at Sicily were transferred from Adrastus to Dionysus (*Hdt.* 5. 67).² This is

¹ Boisacq, s.v., gives references to etymological discussions all of which assume that the word is inherited rather than borrowed.

² See Ridgeway's discussion, *The Origin of Tragedy* 26 ff. Ridgeway would no doubt consider Δωριεῖσι in the Suidas passage an inexact expression for Πελοποννησίοις; but his attempt to rescue tragedy from the Dorians is not successful. To say

the more likely since our words with the base γοργ- also betray tragic affinities; says Suidas: γόργεια παρὰ Δωριεῦσι τὰ τῶν ὑποκριτῶν προσωπεῖα τῶν ἀπὸ τῆς σκηνῆς τραγηδῶν (cf. Hesych., s.v. and Poll. 10. 167).

Another hero whose name belongs here is Γόργασος, grandson of Asclepios, at whose shrine in Pherae of Messenia miraculous cures were performed (see Pausanias 4. 3. 10; 30. 3).

The development of the meaning "dead" or "of the dead" into "grim, terrible" is easy. In certain situations "terrible" is very close to "fierce"; thus the phrase γοργὸν βλέπειν no doubt originally meant "to give a terrifying glance," but it would almost inevitably be interpreted by the subject himself and by all who put themselves in his place as "to give a fierce look." A further development of the meaning "fierce" is to be recognized in Xenophon's γοργός "hot, spirited" of a horse, and in Hellenistic and Byzantine γοργεύομαι "hasten," γοργόπλους, and γοργόπους.

The religious ideas connected with the base γοργ- (the dread of malevolent spirits and in particular of the dead who dwell underground) are of the sort which we have learned to ascribe to the indigenous Aegean culture; they belong clearly to the popular rather than to the Olympian religion. It is not surprising, then, to find the base recurring in a number of place names which can scarcely be Greek. Kretschmer, *Einleitung* 190 f., connects the Γεργίνοι in Cyprus with the Γέργιθες in Miletus, Γεργίθιον, a place near Cyme, and the Γέργιθες in the Troad; and he finds in ancient tradition basis for the theory that the spread of the name resulted from a prehistoric migration from Cyprus northward. There should be added to the group the name of a son of Priam, Γοργυθίων, Il., +, about which the *Etymologicum Magnum* makes the suggestive remark (238. 50): πρέπει γὰρ ἥρωϊ τοῦνομα. The form of the base which we have met in Hesychius' γάργα· αἰγείρος reappears in Γάργαρα, a peak of Mt. Ida, Il., +, and in Γαργηττός, the name of an Attic deme.¹

Hesychius' γέργυπες· νεκροί, then, is a loan word. It appears

nothing of the explicit and unbiased ancient testimony which he has to disregard, the α of the tragic choruses cannot be "old Attic" as he would have us believe.

¹ For the alternation of ορ and αρ, cf. the discussion of πάρονς: πόρονς in CP. 7. 235 ff., especially 240 f.

with slight modification in the Eretrian personal name Γόργυπος. Quite possibly we should think of γόργωψ and γοργωπός as further modifications of it under the influence of the words in -ωψ and -ωπός. Some such history is particularly probable for Γοργῶπις, the name of a lake near Corinth, whose original connection with the dead seems to be faintly reflected in the following (*E.M.* 384. 33 ff.): 'Εσχατιῶτις· λίμνη κειμένη μετὰ τὸν Ἴσθμόν . . . ὕστερον δὲ Γοργῶπις ἐκλήθη ἀπὸ Γοργῆς τῆς Μαγαρέως θυγατρὸς, γυναικὸς Κορίνθου· ἦτις ἀκούσασα τὸν τῶν παίδων φόνον, περιελγὴς γενομένη, ἔρριψεν ἑαυτὴν εἰς τὴν λίμνην.

A small group of personal names, chiefly Boeotian, show a stem in -υβ-. The first of them to attract attention were Κόκκυψ, Κοκκουβίας, *IG.* 7. 1745, and Κοκκυβίας, Hesych., which Dittenberger, *ad IG.* 7. 1745, combined with the bird name κόκκυξ on the assumption that the Boeotian form of the latter was *κόκκυψ (cf. βάνα=γύνη, etc.). Bechtel, *Spitznamen* 13, similarly identified Κόρυψ with Hesychius' κόρυξ· νεανίσκος (: Ion. κοῦρος, Arcad. κόρφα, etc.). Solmsen, *Rh.M.* 59 (1904). 486, added to the list Αἰσχυρβίων in an inscription of Oropus, *Eph. Arch.* 1895. 131 ff. 27, 31, and Θάρυψ, the name of a Molossian king. The last-mentioned word appears most commonly in our sources with -υπ- (Θάρυψ, -πος, Thuc., Paus.; Θαρύπας, Plut.); but Solmsen is probably right in thinking that an original Θάρυψ, -βος (so Herodian 2. 751. 5 L.) was partially assimilated to the personal names in -ωψ and -όπας (cf. *CP.* VII. 432 ff.). It is difficult to see why he seeks another origin for Θάρωψ, to which we may now add Θάρωπος. Solmsen considers Epirote Θάρυψ proof that -υβ- in Boeotian personal names belongs to the Northwest Greek part of that dialect, rather than to the Aeolic element, as Sadée, *Diss. Phil. Hal.* 16. 149, had held.

It is, however, probable that the name was Illyrian, as its bearer certainly was. See most recently Martin Nilsson *Studien zur Geschichte des alten Epeiros*, and a review of this by Th. Lenschau, in *BPhW.* 1912. 341 f. Although Illyrian shows *d* parallel to Greek *θ*, the latter character appears in words of undoubted Illyrian origin; e.g., Θεσπρωτοί, Βουθρωτόν. Furthermore, there seems to be no satisfactory Greek etymology for the word, since the prevailing orthography with -ρ- instead of -ρρ- or -ρσ- is against the derivation

from *θαρός*.¹ At any rate, *Θάρυψ* can scarcely be said to throw any light upon the Greek names in *-υβ-*.

It is also unlikely that these words are to be explained by a dialectic change of *g*² to *β* instead of to *γ* after *υ*; for names in *-υβ-* are not confined to Boeotia. Even Oropian *Αἰσχυρίβων* is Euboean rather than Boeotian, as is shown by Eretrian *Αἰσχυρίβης*, *Eph. Arch.* 1911. 12. 133; 15. 111; 17. 5.; 19. 2. *Αἰσχυρίβας*, *IG.* 12. 8. 63. 17, is the name of an Athenian. We have also mythic *Πόλυβος*, *Πολύβη*, and *Καλύβη*, and Suidas cites *Τολύβη*. There is, then, no great plausibility in the theory that *Κόκκυψ*, and *Κόρυψ*, *κόρυψ* (?), are regularly developed forms of *κόκκυξ* and *κόρυξ* respectively. They more probably differ from these latter in containing the suffix *-β-*, which is fairly common in personal names. Similarly Boeotian *Κίνυψ*² contains the base of the mythic name *Κινύρας*. These names should have been included in our list of personal names with suffix *-β-* (*CP.* V. 337-40).

With Molossian *Θάρυψ* we should compare the Epirote names *Ἀρύββας* or *Ἀρύμβας* and Thessalian *Τορύββας* or *Τορύμβας*,³ in which, as was shown by Kretschmer, *Einleitung* 258, *μβ* is graphic for *ββ* as in *Σαμβάτιος* = *Σαββάτιος*, etc. In fact the striking resemblance between the stems *Θαρυβ-* and *Τορυββ-* may possibly indicate a connection in root as well as in suffix.

No doubt there are other loan words in our lists. In particular we have found so many foreign words terminating in *-οψ* and *-ωψ* (*μόνωψ*, *ἐλ[λ]οψ* [?], *αἰγίλωψ*, *γάωψ* [?], *πρίοπες* [?], *δρώψ*, **Ρόψ*, *γόργωψ*, *Θάροψ*) that we may well suspect a foreign source for some of the remaining words of obscure etymology which show these terminations. An "Aegean" origin was advocated for *πάρνοψ*, *κόρνοψ*, etc., in *CP.* VII. 235 ff. On *Δρύοπες*, cf. Kretschmer *Glotta* 1. 15 f. Quite possibly, then, the obscure Homeric epithets of bronze, *ἦνοψ* and *ῥωροψ*, were borrowed from the language of the people from whom the ancestors of the Greeks got their first bronze. In that case the name of the Paenonian *Νώροπες* gets a new suggestiveness.

¹ No doubt the modified forms *Θάροψ* and *Θάροπος* were popularly connected with that stem, and consequently we enter them in our lists as compounds. Is Arcadian *Θάρυξ*, *-κος*, Paus. 4. 24. 1, also of Illyrian origin?

² Sadée, *Diss. Phil. Hal.* 16. 149, connects it with the Lybian river *Κίνυψ*.

³ Accordingly *Τορύμβας*, *Τορύββας* should not have been included among the personal names with formative *β* in *CP.* V. 340.

WORD-LISTS

WORDS IN -ψ; GEN. -βος

The gender is indicated if it is known

- *Αραψ, ὁ, P.
 λάτραψ, Hesych. [V. 327, 334.
 φάψ, ἡ, Aesch. fr. 210, 257 Nauck, +
 [V. 331.
 φλέψ, ἡ, Hom., +
 -φλεψ, ὁ, ἡ
 ᾶ-, Melet. in Cram. An. Ox.
 †μυριό-, Jo. Staurac. in Act. SS.
 Oct. 4. 206 E.
 μελανό-, Aretae.
 ἀργυρό-, Schol. Plat. Tim. 25 B.
 †ῥόδύ-, Philes (Koum.).
 λίψ, ἡ, Aesch., +
 λίψ, ὁ, Hdt., +
 ἄλψ, Hesych., +
 χοιρό-θλιψ, ὁ, ἡ, Ar.
 βορρό-λιψ, ὁ, ἡ, Ptol. (Soph.).
 νίβα· χιόνα, Hesych. [VI. 212.
 Νίψ, P. [VI. 212.
 χέρ-νιψ, ἡ, Hom., +
 -τριψ, ὁ, ἡ
 ᾶ-, Phryn. Praep. Sophist. 17.15
 de Borries, +
 ἀμφί-, Archil. 134 Bgk.⁴
 παλίν-, CGL. 2. 207. 44.
 Σύν-, P.
 αἰγό-, Dion. H.
- πεδό-, Luc., +
 θησειό-, Ar. fr. 448 Bl.
 οἰκό-, Ar., +
 ἄλό-, Ariston in Anth. P.
 πορνό-, antiqui ap. Phryn. 491
 Ruth.
 †ἀγωνό-, Philodem. (Herw.).
 †χοιρό-, Herodian 1. 246. 26, 2.
 751. 13 L.
 ἀχυρό-, Philipp. in Anth. P.
 σκενό-, Herodian 1. 246. 25 L.
 ἄστυ-, Critias 72 Diels, +
 †Κόκκυψ, ὁ, IG. 7. 1888 [VIII. 339.
 †Κάλυβι, τῇ, Soph. Niob. in pap.
 Oxy. 2. 213 (a) 6.
 Χάλυψ, ὁ, P.
 χάλυψ, ὁ, Aesch., +
 †? Μυγδί-λυψ, ὁ, ἡ, Plaut. Poen.
 1033 [VIII. 334.
 †Κίνυψ, ὁ, IG. 7. 3636, 3637 [VIII.
 340.
 †Θάρυψ, Herodian 2. 751. 5 L. [VIII.
 339.
 κρύβες, Hesych.
 †κόρνυψ (MS. -ιψ), ὁ, Hesych. [VIII.
 340.
 †Κόρυψ, ὁ, IG. 7. 3640 [VIII. 339.

WORDS IN -ψ; GEN. -πος

The gender is indicated if it is known

- λαῖλαψ, ἡ, Hom., +
 Λαῖλαψ, ὁ, P.
 -λαῖλαψ
 χρηματο-, ἡ, Ps.-Ignat. ad Magn.
 202 Zahn, +
 βαρυ-, ὁ, ἡ, Philipp. in Anth. P.
 μάψ, see Brugmann IF. 27. 260.
 θέραψ, ὁ, Ion, +
- σκέψ, sign. inc., Herodian 1. 404.
 14 L.
 κατῶ-βλεψ, Archelaus Chers. ap.
 Ath. 409 C, +
 κλέψ, Herodian 1. 404. 14 L.
 -κλεψ, ὁ, ἡ
 νακό-, Herodian 1. 246. 24 L.
 δλενρό-, Herodian loc. cit.

- κλέψ, ὁ, ἡ
 τυρό-, Herodian loc. cit.
 ? βοῖ-, Soph. fr. 932 Nauck.
 βοῖ-, Soph. fr. 927 Nauck.
 δρύ-πεπα, τήν, Cornelius Longus in
 Anth. P. 6. 191. 4.
 †θής, ὁ, Herodian 1. 404. 14, 2. 750.
 37 L.
 κώληψ, ἡ, Hom., +[VII. 435.
 σήψ, ἡ "a sore," Hipp. 1. 228. 6
 Kühlew.
 σήψ, ὁ (ἡ, Diosc. 1. 68), a serpent,
 Arist. Mir. 846 b 11, +
 ἱψ, ὁ, Hom., +
 †μάγγιπες, Eust. de Capt. Thess. 413
 Bekk.
 σκίψ, Choerob. in Cram. An. Ox. 2.
 258. 17.
 ἡλαψ, ὁ, Schol. Theocr.
 αἰγίλαψ, ὁ, ἡ, Hom., +
 Αἰγίλαψ, ἡ, P.
 ἀργίλαψ, ὁ, ἡ, Nic.
 κνίψ, ὁ, Ar., +
 σκνίψ, ὁ (pl. σκνίφες, Origen c.
 Celsum 5. 7), Stratt. 2. 790
 Mein., +
 †πνίψ, Choerob. in Cram. An. Ox. 2.
 258. 19.
 ῥίψ, ἡ, Od. 5. 256(?), Hdt., +
 ἔριπες· δαλοί, Hesych.
 θρύψ, ὁ, Theophr., +
 Κεντόριπες, P.[VIII. 334
 ὤψ, ἡ "voice," Hom., +
 ὤψ, ἡ "sight," Emped. 88 Diels.
 -οψ
 ἄ-, ὁ, ἡ, Hesych.
 †[? χαλκ]έ-, ὁ, ἡ, Pind. Paean 3.
 94.
 αἰθ-, ὁ, ἡ, Hom., +
 Αἰθ-, ὁ, P.
 Ἰ-, ὁ, P.
 δί-, ὁ, ἡ, Hesych.
 †Θί-, ὁ, IG. 4. 561.[VII. 432.
 Αἰθι-, ὁ, P.[VII. 427.
 †Ψευδαίθι-, ὁ, Eust. (Th.).
 Λευκαίθιπες, P.
 †συγκλίος, Interpol. Diosc. 3. 28.
 πρίπες, Hesych. [VIII. 336.
 τρι-οψ, Hesych.
 Τρι-, P.
 Δουρί- (MSS. Δευρί-), Strabo 7.
 326; P.[VII. 427.
 σκάλ-, ὁ, Ar. [VII. 424.
 χηνάλοψ, Hesych. [VII. 425.
 β(ε)έλοπες, Did. ap. Hesych., +
 πηνέλοψ, ὁ (dialectic, πανέλοψ), Al-
 caeus 48 Crusius, + [VII. 424.
 Πελ-οψ, ὁ, P.[VII. 433.
 μῆλ-, ὁ, ἡ, Hom., +
 κύκλ-, ὁ, ἡ, Emped. 84. 8 Diels.
 ἔλ(λ)- (also ἔλαψ, ἔλοψ), ὁ, epithet
 of fishes and a kind of fish, Hes.,
 + [VII. 424, VIII. 336.
 ἔλλ-, ὁ, ἡ "mute," Emped. 3
 Diels, +
 †ἔλλ-, ὁ, ἡ "invisible," Theocr.
 Syrinx 18.
 Ἑλλ-, ὁ, P. [VII. 426.
 κόλλοψ, ὁ "peg of a lyre," Hom., +
 κόλλοψ, ὁ "thick skin on animals'
 necks," Ar. fr. 486, 634 Bl., +
 δόλ-οψ, ὁ, ἡ, Hesych. [VII. 425.
 Δολ-, ὁ, P. [VII. 426, 432.
 ἀνθόλοψ, ὁ, Eust. Hexaem. (Th.)
 [VII. 424.
 σκόλοψ, ὁ, Hom., +
 Μελάν-οψ, ὁ, P.
 πάν-, ὁ, ἡ, CIG. 7603.
 Πάν-, ὁ, P.
 †παχάνοψ, sign. inc., pap. Tebt. 1.
 214.
 ἥν-οψ, ὁ, ἡ, Hom., + [VII. 427,
 VIII. 340.
 Ἥν-, ὁ, P.
 φαῖν-, ὁ, ἡ, Ps.-Manetho 4. 239, +
 Φαῖν-, ὁ, P.
 οῖν-, ὁ, ἡ, Hom., + [VII. 422.
 Οῖν-, ὁ, P. [VII. 432.

- πάρν- (also πόρνοψ, κόρνοψ), ὁ, Ar.,
 + [VII. 235-244, 424.
 Στέρν-, ὁ, P.
 ἔποψ, ὁ, Aesch. fr. 304 Nauck, +
 [VII. 425.
 *Ἐποψ, ὁ, P.
 †ὔποψ, ὁ, LXX De. 14. 17 (v. l.
 ἔποπα).
 †Θάρ-οψ, ὁ, IG. 7. 3172 [VIII. 339.
 *Ἀλκάρ-, ὁ, P.
 χάρ-, ὁ, ἡ, Opp.
 Χάρ-, ὁ, P.
 χέδροψ, ὁ, Python p. 811. 12 Nauck, +
 ἔροψ, Hesych. [VII. 425.
 ἄέρ-οψ, Hesych. [VII. 424.
 *Ἀέρ-, ὁ, P. [VII. 427.
 γεργέροψ (or γεργέλοψ), Hesych. [VII.
 424.
 μέρ-οψ, ὁ, ἡ, Hom., + [VII. 427.
 μέρ-, ὁ, Arist., + [VII. 425.
 Μέρ-, ὁ, P. [VII. 427.
 †*ἡπερ-, [VII. 427.
 στέρ-, ὁ, ἡ, Soph. [VII. 423.
 †Φέρ-, IG. 12. 2. 450.
 εἶροψ, ὁ, Arist. (vv. ll. ἀέροπα, μέ-
 ροπα) [VII. 425.
 Κέκρ-οψ, ὁ, P. [VII. 433.
 καλαῦροψ, ἡ, Hom., +
 νῶρ-οψ, ὁ, ἡ, Hom., + [VII. 427,
 [VIII. 340.
 Νώροπες, P. [VII. 432.
 σείσ- (MS. σέσ-), Hesych. [VII. 424.
 μέσσ-, Hesych. [VII. 425.
 δρύ-, ὁ, Ar., + [VII. 424.
 Δρύ-, ὁ, P. [VII. 426, VIII. 340.
 εὔροπα, τόν "far-seeing," Hom.,
 + [VII. 421 f.
 εὔρύ-, ὁ, ἡ "far-sounding," Poeta
 ap. Plut. 2. 1096 A.
 Μάψ-, ὁ, P. [VII. 433.
 γύψ, ὁ, Hom., + [VIII. 336.
 γέργνψ, Hesych. [VIII. 337.
 πάλνψ, ὁ, Diph. Siphn. ap. Ath. 356
 E, + [VII. 434.
 κνν-οὔπες ἄρκοι, Μακεδόνες, He-
 sych. [VII. 424.
 *Ρύψ, *Ρύπες, *Ἀρυπες, P. [VIII. 336.
 Θάρνψ, ὁ, P. [VIII. 339.
 γρήψ, ὁ, Hes. fr. 61 Rz., + [VI. 200.
 †λευκό-γρνψ, ὁ, CGL. 3. 188. 29,
 258. 16.
 ? τύψ, Helladius ap. Phot. Bibl.
 279.
 ? προ-τύψ, id. ib.
 ὦψ, ἡ (ὁ, Eust. 1426. 57; pl. τὰ ὦπα,
 Plat. Crat. 409 C), Hom., +
 *ὦψ, ὁ, P.
 -οψ
 ἀλα-, ὁ, ἡ, Synes. [VII. 429.
 ἀγλα-, ὁ, ἡ, Soph.
 κερα-, ὁ, ἡ, Maxim. Epirota.
 γώνψ, ὁ, Hesych. [VIII. 336.
 φλογ-ώνψ, ὁ, ἡ, Aesch.
 γοργ- ὁ, ἡ, Eur. [VII. 428, VIII.
 339.
 ἄζ-, ὁ, ἡ, Hesych. [VII. 429.
 κνύζωψ, Hesych.
 θώνψ, ὁ, Hdt., +
 ἰώνψ, ὁ, Nic. fr. 18 Schn., +
 †ἐρι-ώνψ, ὁ, ἡ, Max. Epirota.
 κώνψ, ὁ, Arist. ap. Ael. N. A. 15. 28,
 Ath. 391 C, Theognost. A. B.
 1418,¹ Speusippus ap. Ath. 391
 C.

¹ Herwerden, s.v., proposes to emend Theognostus so as to ascribe the spelling σκώνψ to Aristotle and the spelling κώνψ to others. Aelian and Athenaeus, however, say that Aristotle drew a distinction between two varieties of owl which he called σκώνψ and κώνψ respectively. This can hardly be a broken reflection of the distinction between σκώνψ and δεισκώνψ which is found in H.A. 9. 617 b 31ff.; for Aelian mentions that also. Cf. Hoffmann *Maked.* 47.

- κῶψ, ὁ
 ἐλίκ-ωψ, ὁ, ἦ, Hom., + [VII. 422.
 τετραελίκ-, ὁ, ἦ, Hesych.
 κέρκ-, ὁ, a kind of ape, Manil. 4.
 668 [VII. 424.
 κέρκ-, ὁ "knave," Aeschin., +
 Κέρκ-, ὁ, P. [VII. 427.
 σκῶψ· ὁ σκώπτῃς, Herodian 1. 404.
 20 L.
 σκῶψ, ὁ "owl," Hom., +
 αἰ-σκωψ, ὁ, Arist., +
 γλανκ-ώψ, ὁ, ἦ, Pind.
 λῶψ, ὁ, Hesych. [VII. 425.
 †? ἀνθάλ-ωψ, Debrunner IF. 23. 23
 without ref.
 αἰμά-λωψ, ὁ, Ps.-Hipp. 21. 328
 Kühn., + [VII. 425.
 θυμάλ-ωψ, ὁ, Ar. Ach. 321, etc., +
 [VII. 425.
 ἡμερ-άλωψ, ὁ, ἦ, Galen (Th.).
 νυκτ-άλωψ, ὁ, ἦ, Ps.-Hipp. 21. 227
 Kühn., + [VII. 429.
 ἰάλ-ωψ, ὁ, Pallad. (Th.) [VII. 425.
 παρα-βλώψ, ὁ, ἦ, Hom., +
 ἀμβλ-ώψ, ὁ, ἦ, Soph. ap. Phot. R.
 16 f., +
 κυνο-βλώψ, ὁ, ἦ, Hesych.
 ἱπο-βλώψ, ὁ, ἦ, Eust. (Th.).
 †μέλ-ωψ, ὁ (or μέλοψ), CGL. 4.
 258. 12, etc. [VII. 425.
 †ῥέλ-, Act. SS. Iun. 7. 245 A. [VII.
 425.
 αἰγίλ-, ἦ "wild oats," Theophr., +
 [VII. 425.
 αἰγίλ-, ἦ, a kind of oak, Theophr.,
 + [VII. 426.
 μυρτίλωψ, Hesych. [VII. 424.
 φιλ-ώψ· φίλος, ὁ, ἦ, Hesych. [VII.
 428.
 Φίλ-, ἦ (or Φλωπίς; see Fick BB.
 22. 47), P.
 ἀγχι-λωψ, ὁ, Galen 19. 438 Kühn
 [VII. 425.
- κλώψ, ὁ, Hdt., +
 ἀρχέ-, ὁ, Plut.
 ὀψί-, ὁ, Ps.-Polemo (Th.).
 βαιό-, ὁ, Lyc.
 γυναικό-, ὁ, Lyc.
 Κύκλ-ωψ, ὁ, P. [VII. 427.
 κύκλ-, ὁ, ἦ, Parmenides 10. 4
 Diels, +
 -κύκλωψ
 συγ-, ὁ, Eust.
 Λαιμο-, ὁ, Alciph. 3. 15.
 μισο-, ὁ, Eust.
 δεινδροκόλ-ωψ, Epiphan. Physiol.
 102 Antwerp. [VII. 424.
 στρογγυλ-, ὁ, ἦ, Schol. Verg. (Th.).
 τυφλ-, ὁ, ἦ, Nic., + [VII. 429.
 μῶλ, ὁ, Hyperid. fr. 200 Blass, +
 [VII. 425.
 παλαιομῶλ-, ὁ, CGL. 2. 392. 37.
 Ἄλμ-, ὁ, P. [VII. 427.
 ν-ώψ, ὁ, ἦ, Hesych. [VII. 425.
 ἐν-ῶπα, Hom. [VII. 422.
 ἀρρεν-ώψ, ὁ, ἦ, Eust. 827, 29.
 Ἴν-, ὁ, P.
 κελαιν-, ὁ, ἦ, Pind., +
 Φαίν-, ὁ, P.
 δειν-, ὁ, ἦ, Soph.
 οἶν-, ὁ, ἦ, Soph., + [VII. 423.
 Οἶν-ῶπες, P. [VII. 432.
 Σίνωψ, P.
 κνώψ, ὁ, ἦ "blind," Anton. Mon.
 1223 [VII. 425.
 κν-ώψ, ὁ "beast," Nic. [VII. 424.
 κίκν-, ὁ, Hesych. [VII. 424.
 μων-, ὁ, ἦ (μουν-, Aesch.), Aesch., +
 μων-, ὁ (=μόναπος), Ael. [VII. 424.
 Κάρν-, ὁ, Cat. Gk. Coins Ionia 53.
 48.
 κύν-, ὁ, Theophr., + [VII. 426.
 ἀχύνωψ, ὁ, Theophr. H.P. 7. 11. 2, +
 κών-ωψ, ὁ, Batrachom. 199, Aesch.,
 + [VII. 424.
 Κών-, ὁ, P.

-κῶνωψ

†οἶνο-, CGL. 3. 258. 34.

ἀερο-, ὁ, ἡ, Luc.

ῥώψ, ἡ, Hom., +

λιπαρ-ώψ, ὁ, ἡ, Philox. 2. 1 Crusius.

δρώψ (also δρόψ), sign. inc., Clem.

Al. 3. 39. 10 Dind., +[VIII. 334.

χαμαί-δρωψ, ἡ, Diosc. 3. 102, +

ἰδρ-ωψ, ὁ "dropsy," Hipp. 23. 724

Kühn [VII. 425.

ἰδρ-, ὁ, ἡ "dropsical, Ps.-Hipp. 22.

511, +[VII. 425.

†ἀμύδρ-, ὁ, ἡ, Theod. Stud. 1256 D

Migne.

φοβερ-, ὁ, ἡ, Orph. H.

χαμαί-ρωνψ, ἡ, Plin., +

Κρῶπες, Androtian fr. 57 Müller
[VII. 427.

ταυρ-ώψ, ὁ, ἡ, Orphic hymn in
Miller Mél. de Liter. Gr. 453.

32.

εὐρ-, ὁ, ἡ, Herodian 1. 247. 20 L.

Εὐρ-, ὁ, P.

Κάσσο-ωπες, P.[VII. 427.

χρυσ-, ὁ, ἡ, Eur.

εὖ-, ὁ, ἡ, Soph.

πολυ-, ὁ, ἡ, Did. Al. 392 C Migne, +

μύ-, ὁ, ἡ, Arist.

μύ-, ὁ, Aesch., +

Μύ-, ὁ, P.

φῶψ· φάος, Hesych.[VII. 435.

WORDS IN ψ-; GEN. -φος

The gender is indicated if it is known

πελεθο-βάψ, ὁ, ἡ, Herodian 1. 246.

12 L., +

πλινθο-βάψ, ὁ, ἡ, id. ib.

†κόλαψ, CGL. 2. 188. 45.

δρνο-, Hesych. s.v. ἔππα, CGL. 3.

18. 4, +

†γράψ, ἡ, sign. inc., Herodian 1. 404.

13, etc.

†ᾶ-γραψ, ὁ, ἡ, Theod. Stud. 440 C

Migne.

Σκίραψ, ὁ, P.

κατῆλιψ, ἡ, Ar., +

νίφα, τήν, Hes.

σκηῖφες, Origen, +

†πνύψ, Choerob. in Cram. An. Ox. 2.

258. 19.

γρύψ, ὁ, Verg. E. 8. 27, +[VI. 200.

WORDS IN -ψ; STEM UNKNOWN

The gender is indicated if it is known

ζάψ, ἡ, Cratin. Min. 3. 379 Mein., +

†λάψ, sign. inc., Herodian 1. 404. 13,

525. 19, 2. 10. 3 L.

μάψ· ὀρνεόν τι, Herodian 1. 404. 12,

491. 8, 2. 182. 10 L.

κνάψ, ὁ, Herodian 1. 404. 12 L.

δράψ, sign. inc., Ar. fr. 588, 665 Bl.

?ῥήψ, Anton. Mon. 1610.

λάψ, ἡ, Hesych.

σκούψ, Hesych.

?ῑριψ, Hesych.

κόριψ (or -νι?), ὁ, Hesych. [VIII. 340.

ζάμψ (Bentley; MS.: ζάψ), sign. inc.,

Clem. Al. 3. 38 Dind. [VIII. 334.

?χρέ(μ)ψ, MSS. inferiores Arist. H.

A. 4. 8. 534 a 8.

δνόψ, Hesych.

†σκάψ, sign. inc., Choerob. in Cram.

An. Ox. 2. 263.

σττύψ, sign. inc., Herodian 1. 404.

17 L.

ADDITIONS AND CORRECTIONS

(CP. V. 326-56; VI. 197-215, 450-76; VII. 420-41, VIII. 65-87.)¹

WORDS IN -βη AND -βᾱ

- †Διαβά, Itinerarium ab Edem Paradisi 33, 38 in Rh.M. 65. 606 ff. Θάμβη, Ninos Romance A 4. 22 f. in Hermes 28. 172 f.
 (ποδοστράβη), Hyperid. Fr. 62 Blass. †Σόβη, IG. 2. 789 a 71, 790 a 16, etc.
 φάβα· μέγας φόβος, καὶ τὸ σύνηθες, †αεροφόβη, late medic. (Castelli).
 ὁσπριον, Hesych. †κρυβή, Vett. Val. 40. 31 Kroll.
 *Ηβη, P.

WORDS IN -βης AND -βᾱς; GEN. -βου

- †Διαβάς, Amm. Marcell. 23. 6. 21. Cf. Meyer-Lübke, Rom. Et. Wtb.]
 †Αδισβάς, id. ib. †Σόβας (or Σοβάς, -άδος), SGDI. 3160.
 [φάλας. Undoubtedly borrowed, as suggested V. 331. Triandaphyllidis, Die Lehnwörter der mittelgriechischen Vulgärliteratur 13, gives φαλβός from Latin *falvus*. This late Latin form occurring CGL. 4. 345. 23 is itself of Germanic origin. †Βουβας is a Thracian word according to Tomaschek Sitzungsberichte d. wien. Akad. 131. 1. 16. Delete also in V. 338 l. 13.]
 †Αισχυρήβης, IG. 12. 8. 63. 17, inser. Eph. Arch. 1911. 12. 133, 15. 111, etc. [VIII 340.]

WORDS IN -βος AND -βον; GEN. -βου

- (κάλαβος) "peg of the lyre," Plut. 2. 1030 B. (διθύραμβος). Some support for the theory (V. 330) that the variation of the second member of this compound from the uncompounded θρίαμβος was due to the influence of θύσος, etc., is furnished by Jo. Lyd. de Mens. 1. 2: θρίαμβον ὀνόμαζον οἱ Διονύσου θεράποντες τὴν πομπὴν ἀπὸ τῶν θύσων καὶ τῶν ἰάμβων οἰονίε τῶν σκωμμάτων, ὥσανεὶ θυρσίαμβον.
 ἔναβος = ἔνηβος, Theocr. ἄκραβος = ἄκρηβος, Theocr. 8. 93. (ὑπόστραβος), Vett. Val. 110. 6 Kroll. †διάρταβος, on, pap. Oxy. 7. 1031. †ἡμάρταβος, on, ib. Κάσταβος, P. (Κότταβος), SGDI. 4702 b 16. †Τόρρηβος, coin of Hierapolis in Phrygia (Head Hist. Numm. 675). †Φιλέφηςβος, IG. 12. 1. 107. 2. †μελλοέφηςβος, pap. Oxy. 9. 1202. 17. †παρέφηςβος, IG. 13. 3. 340. 19. †βαθύολβος, on, Eust. (Herw.). [βαρύολβος. See Herwerden.] (μελίαμβος), Cercidas Cyn. 4. 1. 7 in pap. Oxy. 8. †νυκτέρεμβος, on (MS.; Kroll νυκτί-), Vett. Val. 16. 11. By haplology from sq. (νυκτερίεμβος, on), Ptol. Tetrab. (Th., Soph.). †Σκόμβος, BCH. 27. 13. 1. 12.

¹ The arrangement follows that of the word-lists, but corrections to the discussion are included. Lemmata in parentheses are not to be added to the word-lists. Several s-stems are included for convenience. Articles in square brackets involve deletion.

(τύμβος). Persson, Beiträge zur indogermanischen Wortforschung 584, doubts the current theory that this word contains Indo-European *-gmo-* (so V. 326). He sees instead a labial suffix, and compares τύφη, a material for stuffing pillows, which would then stand in the same relation to it as κορυφή to κόρυμβος, etc. (cf. VI. 214 f.).

(στρογγυλόβολος, *ον*), Theophr. H.P. 8. 5. 2.

(μακρόβολος, *ον*), id. ib.

†Αείφορβος, inser. Eph. Arch. 1911. 18. 37.

(φλοῖσβος). The meaning "wave" (V. 328) is carried back to the first century B.C. by the phrase φλοῖσβον ἐριβρεμέθοντα in the hymn to Isis in IG. 12. 5. 739. 166.

†κυβός, Macedonian for κυφός, Orion (Hesych.).

[βούβος, f. l., Theocr. 14. 17. Delete also s.v. βυβός, and V. 334 l. 16.]

†ἐπιθορύβως, Vett. Val. 184. 31 Kroll.

†ἐπίλωβος, *ον*, Vett. Val. 180. 23 Kroll.

WORDS IN -φη AND -φα

(τύφη). Persson, Beiträge zur indogermanischen Wortforschung 482, 566, connects this word with OIsl. *hūfa* "hill," Lat.

tuber, tufa: Lat. *tu-m-eo*, etc. In that case it should be added to the list of I.-E. words with suffix *-bh-* (VI. 197 f.).

WORDS IN -φης AND -φᾶς; GEN. -φου

†Ἰσογράφης (or ἰσογράφη), Diog. L. 6. 15; see Pohlenz Hermes 42. 158.

[Ὀνόφας is a Persian name, cited from Ctesias by Photius. Delete also in VI. 207 l. 1.]

WORDS IN -φος AND -φον; GEN. -φου

(σύγγραφος, ἡ), SGDI. 4 Messenien Nachtr. 44. 16.

(συμβολαιωγράφος, *ον*), pap. Thead. 10. 22.

(ιδιόγραφος, *ον*), pap. Giessen. 1. 8. 4.

(ᾠρογράφος, *ον*), Erotian 138. 7 Klein.

(δογματογράφος, *ον*), SGDI. 4516. 1.

†Σκύληφος, inser. Eph. Arch. 1911. 13. 135.

(ψή-φος, ἡ), Doric ψᾶ-φος, is surely to be connected with ψά-ω, ψά-ω, ψω-μός, etc. Probably it was at first an adjective meaning "rubbed small, broken by rubbing" or "rubbed smooth, polished." It should be added

to the list in V. 202 ff. See most recently Persson, Beiträge zur indogermanischen Wortforschung 655.

†Μενάληφος, inser. Eph. Arch. 1911. 15. 128.

(σκάριφον), Marc. Diac. 62. 23 Teub. (γρίφος "net"). The doubt about the genuineness of the word (VI. 210) is removed by E. M. 241. 28 ff.: γρίπος· τὸ δίκτυον . . . τὸ δὲ αὐτὸ καὶ γρίφος καλεῖται . . . λέγονται γρίφοι καὶ τὰ δίκτυα καὶ τὰ συμποσιακὰ Ζητήματα. The relationship of γρίπος and γρίφος remains obscure.

- (τῖφος, τό) "marsh," is plausibly connected with τῖλος "thin stool" by Persson, *op. cit.* 464, 566. If Italic *Tiber* and *Tifernus* are related the labial suffix is Indo-European. For the stem-form cf. ἔδαφος, τρύφος (VI. 198), στέρφος, and κέλυφος (below).
- (πολφός), Erotian 111. 11 Klein.
- †κροτῆσιγομφός, *on*, Cercidas Cyn. 2. 2. 4 in pap. Oxy. 8.
- †Ἀριστόνοφος (probably for -νοθος), inscr. Kretschmer Vaseninschriften 10 f.
- †ἀνάτροφον, τό, late medic. (Castelli).
- †δρείτροφος, *on*, Soph. Ichneutae 6. 19.
- (βοτανοτρόφος, *on*), Schol. Eur. Phoen. 647, 1571 Schwartz.
- (ψευδόσσοφος, *on*), Schol. Luc. 119. 12 Rabe.
- (φιλόσοφος, *on*), Tatian. Or. ad Graec. 4. 13 Schwartz.
- ([σ]τέρφος, τό). Persson, Beiträge zur indogermanischen Wortforschung 437, 442, 865, considers this a variant of στέρφος similar to σέρφος: σέριφος (cf. VI. 203). For the stem-form cf. under τῖφος (above).
- †κοινοκρατηρόσκυφος, *on*, Cercidas Cyn. 1. 2. 10 in pap. Oxy. 8.
- (κέλυφος, τό). Persson, *op. cit.* 227, plausibly connects OHG. *helawa*, MHG. *helwe*, *helewe* "chaff." On the stem-form, cf. under τῖφος (above).
- (λινούφος), pap. Giessen 1. 40. 2. 27.
- (κόρυφος), IG. 4. 926, 17, etc. Correct also in VI. 204, 1. 23.

WORDS IN -πη AND -πᾶ

(ἐντύπη), pap. Giessen 1. 12. 6.

WORDS IN -πης, -πᾶς

†Φαιδώπας, SGDI. 1428 a.

WORDS IN -πος AND -πον; GEN. -που

- †(φοβερωπός, ὄν), Orphic frag. ap. Athenag. 20.
- †ἀγγελοπρόσωπος, *on*, Egyptian poet in Rev. d. Ét. gr. 24. 444. 17.
- (μορμορωπός, ὄν), Artemid. 2. 36.

WORDS IN -ψ

(ὑδρωψ, πος). Other medical terms in -ωψ, beside the special group listed in VII. 431, are ἀλαῶψ, ἀλαῶπις, ἀμβλυωπός, κνώψ, κυκλώπιον, μόνωψ, μυωπός, μυωπίας, μυωπάζω, νώψ, ὀξυωπός, τυφλώψ, ὑπώπιον, ὑπωπιάζω. In view of the close historical connection between medicine and philosophy, it is interesting to note that of 20 words in -ωψ- citable from non-Ionic prose of the fifth and fourth centuries, no less than 13 are furnished by the philosophers, Plato, Aristotle,

and Theophrastus (see the list printed by Aly, *Glotta* 5. 71). The physicians and philosophers united with the poets to prolong the life of the obsolescent stem -ωψ-.

Aly's attempt (*loc. cit.*) to confine words of this type to the Central Greek dialects is certainly not borne out by the evidence. It is hardly fair to cite place names in Northeastern Peloponnesus and the usage of Attic poets and philosophers in support of this theory.

NOTES AND DISCUSSIONS

A NOTE ON THE AUGMENT

An article recently published in this Journal (VII, 4) has drawn attention to some difficulties of the augment. Of the points raised not all can be profitably discussed here. In some questions it would be unseemly for me to meddle. For instance, anyone who is dissatisfied with the augment in similes must revise the work of Professor Platt; or if he has his doubts about the iterative, he can correct the grammar of the late Dr. Monro. In other cases, such as the augmentation of the main body of aorists and imperfects, the dispute is beyond the compass of a short paper, where it is impossible to enumerate the examples. Dr. Shewan will agree that in such matters there is no need for haste or alarm. If there are more augments than I made out, they will not run away; if there are fewer, no false examples can now be foisted into the text—that possibility has been past for some centuries. But there are some uses so comparatively rare that their occurrences can be enumerated; where this is so, it will be possible to debate the facts. Sometimes the facts themselves are conceded by Dr. Shewan; here we can reasonably argue the interpretation. In this way discussion may be restricted to four points.

a) The extreme rarity of the temporal augments like that in *ἤυσε* may be taken as a test case. Clearly, the explanation must be partly metrical. But is the explanation purely metrical? If it is, why are forms like *ὄρουσε* unknown in the similes? Or let us ignore the similes, and suppose that *ὄρουσε* is a purely scansional form, motivated by the dislike of spondees. Our troubles then begin all over again. When spondees are fairly caused by the sense of a passage, there is no clear avoidance of them. To take simple instances, closed trochees are often used as spondees (*ταρσὸν δεξιέριον*, || *ταρσὸν ποδός*, etc.); so too, scansional forms like || *τόν δέ*, || *τοῦ δέ*, etc., seem quite normal. If then the augment in narrative was from the first felt as part of the sense, it is not easy to understand the taboo of *ὄρουσε*. But let this pass, and in spite of forms like *ἐξῆγε*, *ἡγείτο*, *ἔζεσκε* etc.,¹ let us suppose that spondees of the type *ἤκουσε* were especially offensive. Is it not interesting that these offensive spondees are relatively much commoner in the

¹ The forms are (*Iliad*, narr.) αἰπεινά, ἀμφ' αὐτόν, ἀμφέσταν, ἀέοντο, Ἄρηι, αὐτοῖο, ἔχοντο, εἰσῆλθε, ἐκβαλλε, ἐκκαλτο, ἐκκίπτον, ἐκ τοῖο, ἐξαῖτις, ἐξῆγε, ἐξῆρχε, (ἐξῆκε?), ἐμπλήτο, ἐς μέσσον, εὐδῆσι, εὐρησι, εὐχοντο, ἡβαιόν, ἡγείτο, ἡγον δέ, ἡντησε, ἡρᾶτο, ἡρπαξε, ἦτε τε, ἰδρυσσε, ἔζεσκε, ἔχοντο, ἱμάσι, ἱμερτόν, ἱππεῖον, (ἱρισσι), ἰσταντο, ἰφθίμα, οἰχνεσκε, οἰκλίσιν, ὄρσασκεν, ὄρσαντο, οὐδάσδε, οὐτασκε, οὐτῆσε, ὕμνῃν, ὠκτεψε, ὠμοῖν (genit.), ὠπλίσσε, ὠρυνντο, ὠρμᾶτο, ὠσαντο, ὠσαντο.

narrative of the *Odyssey*, and that the use becomes so far enfranchised that we actually find scansions like ἦναιεν || θεράπων? Or if this is still not significant, does it not become so when we find in the *Odyssey* an increasing plenty of other unnecessary spondees? when we find the alternatives in -σ- and -σσ- less exactly handled? when we see spondaic datives in -εσσι (types πάντεσσι and ἀνδρεσσιν) going up by leaps and bounds? Does not an inference suggest itself?

b) Tenses with syllabic augment followed by δέ. Dr. Shewan urges the improbability of an amphibrach standing after the weak caesura. Especially for amphibrachs beginning with a vowel the conditions are quite unfavorable—so unfavorable, he says, that we must not be surprised at the non-appearance of || ἔθηκε δέ or anything of the kind in the whole narrative of the *Iliad*. Very good indeed; τριδραχμόν γε θούρμηνεμα. But it gives rise to a puzzle; for if type || ἔθηκε δέ is so reassuringly improbable, why is type || ἔγειρε δέ so startlingly actual? In the *Iliad* without B², etc.,¹ (narr.) there are no less than ten instances—E 496, Z 105, A 213, P 544, P 552, ἔγειρε δέ; P 615, ἄμυνε δέ; Σ 35, ἄκουσε δέ; N 27, ἀταλλε δέ; O 361, ἔρειπε δέ; T 386, ἄειρε δέ (add I 189, ρ 216).

Leaving Dr. Shewan and the ungrateful Homer to settle this trifle between themselves, let us look at other instances of the syllabic followed by δέ. The explanation of their rarity is to be this: the aorist followed by δέ comes most often at the beginning of the line; only aorists with two initial consonants can give syllabic augments at the beginning of the line; so we may expect to find that the syllabic followed by δέ is rare even at the beginning of the line. Very good again. But why is the syllabic followed by δέ relatively rare here? Among unaugmented aorists there are in the *Iliad* without B², etc., some 300 starting the line; of these about 160, or 8 in every 15, are followed by δέ. Of augmented aorists in the same position there are 42 instances;² only 6 of these are followed by δέ (add 1 γάρ). Was there not some dislike of the syllabic followed by δέ? The dislike was perhaps slowly weakening; for in the *Odyssey* (narr.), of the 20 augmented aorists³ at the beginning of the line, 10 are followed by δέ (add 1 γάρ). Just for fun, let us take a peep at ι, κ, λ, μ. Here there are 14 augmented aorists starting the verse;⁴ 10 of them are followed by δέ. Homer is so thoughtless in distributing his examples. And there are things of which he will give no

¹ The books B 484-end, Θ, I, K, Ψ, and Ω are split off from the *Iliad*, and are called for short B², etc.

² Leaving out words like ἔδραμον and ἐκδραμο, my list is A 46, B 101, 279, 467, Δ 479, E 83, 108, 309, Z 375, 468, A 397, 848, M 461, N 339, 520, 543, 608, 677, Σ 179, 392, 452, 519, Π 314, 322, 334, 585, 639, 701, P 11, 303, 334, Y 61, 262, 280, 282, 477, Φ 70, 145, 548, 551, 601, X 463.

³ β 427, γ 454, ε 392, 444, η 234, θ 304, 325, ν 55, ξ 34, 50, π 12, σ 97, τ 448, χ 17, 115, 121, 332, ω 102, 392, 441.

⁴ ι 484, 541, κ 97, 148, 220, 310, 397, λ 24, 35, 208, 390, 471, 615, μ 169.

sure narrative examples at all—none of type $\epsilon\beta\eta\delta'$ ($\epsilon\beta\alpha\nu\delta'\alpha\pi\alpha$, $\epsilon\delta\nu\delta'\alpha\pi\alpha\mu\nu$ etc.) after the weak caesura, none of types $\epsilon\pi\acute{\alpha}\gamma\eta\delta'$, $\epsilon\pi\omicron\rho\epsilon\nu\delta'$, $\epsilon\kappa\iota\omicron\nu\delta'\alpha\pi\alpha$, etc., after the strong. Now look at κ 397 and at π 230. Odd little facts, these. Odd too the chance that type $\epsilon\kappa\acute{\epsilon}\lambda\epsilon\nu\sigma\epsilon\delta\acute{\epsilon}$ standing after the hephthemimeral will always scan the other way about— Γ 259 ($\epsilon\tau\acute{\alpha}\rho\omicron\nu\varsigma\delta\acute{\epsilon}\kappa\acute{\epsilon}\lambda\epsilon\nu\sigma\epsilon$) Λ 584, P 596 ($\Delta\alpha\nu\alpha\omicron\nu\varsigma\delta\acute{\epsilon}\phi\acute{o}\beta\eta\sigma\epsilon$), Φ 407, \omicron 547. Γ 381 = Y 444 is a shift from $\kappa\epsilon\acute{\alpha}\lambda\nu\pi\tau\omicron\delta'\alpha\rho'$; and in Φ 389¹ those who care to look can still see the poet either nodding or winking.

c) The aorist with $\nu\hat{\nu}\nu$. This is my list:²

- I) aug. 1) certain a) A 354, 418, B 274, Γ 439, Δ 12, E 882, H 330, Θ 500, I 426, Λ 362, 363, M 271, O 719, P 153, Σ 111, Y 449, 450, Φ 82, X 15? Ω 35, 685, δ 817, 829, ρ 456, 567? ω 259? (cf. A 391).

β) Ψ 406, β 28.

γ) A 507, B 240, Δ 179, Θ 370? N 78? 772, Ξ 95, P 173, X 18, α 182, 241, δ 727, θ 330, ι 495, ξ 371, π 223, ρ 524, τ 369 (cf. Λ 663, θ 13).

2) uncertain— Γ 405, 415, E 423, Z 338, I 118, 519, Σ 267, 293? Ψ 333, Ω 401, α 43, 194, κ 43, \omicron 268, 270, π 66, ρ 568, τ 484? χ 29.

II) unaug. 1) certain — A 445, B 114 = I 21, Γ 367, K (117), 406, N 453, X 252, Ψ 604, Ω 641, α 36? ζ 172, ι 516, ν 303 = π 233. (cf. π 181).

2) uncertain— B 82, I 700, K 124, Y 350, Φ 80, δ 209.

The following are ignored—I), 1), a) E 823, Z 126, Σ 292, 406, X 236, Ω 642, α 235, ϵ 304; I), 1), γ) I , 344, Λ 279, X 104, ρ 319, ψ 354; I), 2) ψ 55, 225; II), 1) I 344, 0721, Σ 102, Ω 223.

Outside the similes and gnomes there seems to be no use which shows anything like the same degree of augmentation. Can we not infer that it is the meaning of $\nu\hat{\nu}\nu$ which is the cause here, and that just as a true present sense makes the aug. necessary, so a strong reference to the present makes the aug. desirable? And even if we cling despairingly to $\epsilon\phi\eta\kappa\epsilon\nu$ and $\acute{\alpha}\nu\eta\kappa\epsilon$, must we not see a difference between the figures for the *Iliad* without B^2 , etc., and those for B^2 , etc., or for the *Odyssey*?

d) The true past aorist in speeches. The issue here has been a little confused by the use of the term "dialogue" of which Dr. Shewan seems to

¹ Pretty clearly a shift from e.g., $\sigma\tau\acute{\alpha}\varsigma\epsilon\acute{\xi}\omicron\delta\acute{\alpha}\lambda\omicron\mu\pi\omicron\iota\omega$, $\gamma\acute{\epsilon}\lambda\alpha\sigma\sigma\epsilon\delta\acute{\epsilon}\omicron\iota$, etc.

² Any corrections or additions would be most thankfully received.

take a view perhaps suggested by the practice of Macaulay or of Nestor. However, let us not be delayed by a discussion of words, but agree simply that the augment is more plentiful in "dialogue." There are three natural ways of looking at this. We may suppose that the augment was a tense-sign—a sign not of past but of present reference. Then since the present-reference tense properly belongs to the speeches, we should expect that these would show more augments. This is the view taken by myself; and it fits the facts very well. But it has a fatal objection; it would establish a difference between the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey*! In the latter the present-reference tense is perhaps a shade less augmented than in the *Iliad*; but the narrative within the speeches, which in the *Iliad* was still treated very well, now shows a great rise of augmentation. For example, let us split off from the ἀπόλογοι the introduction and the interlude and all the inset speeches: what is left is narrative,¹ and it is a kind of narrative which shows relatively many more augments than the narratives in the speeches of the *Iliad*. Clearly, this will never do. We must try another way of accounting for the augment in speeches. Well, let us suppose that the augment is dramatic. This will suit dialogue very well; but it has the rather awkward consequence that all the aorists in the similes are especially dramatic, while, e.g., in the battle-pieces of Λ and of Π there is a distinct lack of dramatic tenses.² Driven from this, let us last try the hypothesis that the augment has something to do with the first person (as in ἐμὲ). On this view, a narrator speaking of himself ought to use more augments than when speaking of others. This would do perfectly for the ἀπόλογοι, but hardly for some other passages. The similes are as impersonal as anything can very well be; they should have no more right to the augment than plain narrative has. Again, Nestor's great speech³ in Λ is faithfully concerned with himself; but the ratio of augmentation approaches that in good narrative, and contrasts—beautifully, I nearly said—with the ἀπόλογοι. Of course it is none of my business, but if I were concerned to defend the Unity, I should not admit statistics, and I should not deny them; I should ignore them. That way, and that way alone, νικᾷ τὸν ἅπαντα λόγον.

The above are four principal points in the theory of the augment. The absence of the augment in type ὄρουσε is not purely metrical, though the preservation of the type is undoubtedly helped by the meter. In the *Odyssey*

¹ When the ἀπόλογοι are so treated, Dr. Shewan imperturbably calls them dialogue; you see, they have so many augments.

² To suppose that the augmented aorists in narr. are the more dramatic is an experiment worth trying; it gives delightfully comic results.

³ I mean the "dialogue" which distracted Patroclus and drove him to his death. In technical points this is the finest speech in Homer, and no doubt gave a great impetus to such mimetic work, in which Nestor keeps up his reputation as a raconteur, but scansionally and linguistically he degenerates—οὐδ' ἄρα οἱ ἴς ἑσθ' οἷη πάρος ἔσκειν ἐνὶ γυναικτῇσι γένυσσι.

even this help cannot keep back the tide. The syllabic augment was at first still felt as a compounded element; and a tense so augmented could not well be followed by a conjunction. But at the beginning of the line there is a good deal of pressure to motive this use; the *Iliad* already has some examples (4 out of the 7 are in ΝΞΟ). In the *Odyssey* this use is relatively three times as common; further, a speech-type is thrust into narrative; and a new type appears in the speeches.

As regards the meaning of the augment, we can see that though the prefix was apparently just compatible with past tenses, it was disliked with these; on the metrical evidence the majority of unaugmented forms is very large. This view of the sense is reinforced by the fact that the true present aorist must have the augment; there is also the unsolicited testimonial given by *ῥῖν*. In the *Odyssey* the augment with past tenses is rising; the freer use of amphibrachs (type *ἔθηκε*) is a noticeable point. The old stubbornness of the iteratives is probably due to their special meaning; the treatment of the tense, as of many other things, is conventional in the *Odyssey* where the rule is at last broken. In the speeches, past tenses show a marked rise of augmentation. In many matters, both linguistic and scansional, the speeches, never so exact as narrative, diverge strikingly in the *Odyssey*. An explanation of this fact is badly needed.

Dr. Shewan ends with a perplexing appeal; let me end with a plain avowal. Any case, however good, is generally damaged by overstatement. To avoid this, my reckonings of doubtful points were very often contrived so as to favor the *Odyssey*. For example, elision of the dat. sing. in *-ι* was not counted as precluding the augment; this helps the *Odyssey*. Dibrachs in *-εν* (type *βάλεν*) were not counted as certain, except in the bucolic; this helps the *Odyssey*. The form *ἔλα* hardly occurs in early work, and it is only in early work that *ἔσσε* is demonstrable; the assumption of *ἔσσε* helps the *Odyssey*. There is perhaps some evidence to show that compounds were treated differently in the *Odyssey*, which has nothing to gain from any reckoning based on this. The introductions and resumptions of speeches were treated as a distinct class; they are a distinct class, but not so distinct in the *Odyssey*, for that is their home. In many such ways the difference between the two epics was a little covered over. Of course, in my paper there must be blunders and slips and oversights;¹ but they must be luxuriant indeed if the main positions are to be refuted.

J. A. J. DREWITT

WADHAM COLLEGE, OXFORD

¹ *Class. Quar.* VI, 2, p. 111, l. 16, should read "*ἔπος φάτο* is only found once, v 111 (speech δ 370)."

The narrative imperfect with syllabic augment is followed by δέ five times—P 86, Z 295 = o 108, v 255, ψ 369. Of these P 86 presumably stands for *ἔσπεε δ'*, and this for *ἐκ δέ δέ*. (*Class. Quar.*, *ibid.*, p. 104).

THE WIFE OF GAIUS GRACCHUS AND HER DOWRY

We are told by Plutarch, *C. Gracch.* 17, 4: τὰς οὐσίας αὐτῶν (sc. the Gracchans) ἀπέδοντο πρὸς τὸ δημόσιον. Ἀπέδον δὲ πενήν ταῖς γυναῖξι· τὴν δὲ Γαίον Λικιννίαν καὶ τῆς προικὸς ἀπεστέρησαν.

The statement has been generally accepted: Mommsen, II³, 127: "aus dem Vermögen der getödteten oder verurtheilten Hochverräther, das bis auf die Mitgift ihrer Frauen confiscirt ward," etc.; Leo Bloch, *Soziale Kämpfe im alten Rom*, p. 115: "der Wittwe des Gracchus nahm man selbst ihre Mitgift."

Confiscation of a wife's dowry is, however, a most extraordinary measure, which it would be difficult to parallel in the entire course of Roman history except in those cases in which the wife is charged with direct complicity in her husband's guilt. Did the senate actually carry out such a measure here?

It may be noticed, in the first place, that the senate need not have specifically ordered the seizure of Licinia's dowry, in order to cause her to lose it. The *dos*, of course, was in possession of her husband up to the moment of his death. If the commissioners who were to carry out the confiscation took possession of all the property apparently belonging to Gaius Gracchus, they must necessarily have seized the *res dotales* as well in which Gracchus had only a usufruct. Licinia would in this case very effectively have been deprived of her property, although it could not be said to have been confiscated.

But we should have to admit the substantial accuracy of the report, if the dowry of Licinia had in this way been lost, even if there had technically been no confiscation. If however, the seizure was legally repudiated, the case is widely different. A passage which has seemingly been overlooked may throw light on the whole situation that followed the murder of Gaius:

Dig. 24, 3, 66, pr.: "In his rebus quas praeter numeratam pecuniam doti vir habet, dolum malum et culpam eum praestare oportere Servius ait. ea sententia Publii Mucii est: nam in Licinnia Gracchi uxore, quod res dotales in ea seditione qua Gracchus occisus erat, perissent, ait, quia Gracchi culpa ea seditio facta esset, Licinniae praestari oportere."

The passage comes from the 6th book of Iavolenus' commentaries on the posthumous writings of Labeo. Either through Labeo or directly, he quotes Servius Sulpicius Rufus (probably the *de dotibus*), and from the same source, the actual decision of Publius Scaevola himself. This is of course, incomparably better authority than either Plutarch or, indeed, any of his sources. We are dealing, as a matter of fact, with a contemporary record the transmission of which possesses unimpeachable authenticity.

It is clear that Licinia gets her *dos* back, or part of it. She does not lose it, either as a matter of law or fact. Plutarch is, therefore, wrong. The error probably arose from a misunderstood account of the suit of Licinia.¹

¹ The suit would further settle the question of who Gaius' wife was. Plutarch, following the majority of writers, makes her name Licinia. Nepos (*Plut. Tib. Gr.* 21, 2)

But there are difficulties in the situation. Licinia sues, probably by the usual *actio rei uxoriae*, for the recovery of her dowry. But whom? Who had the property which formed part of her *dos*? Mommsen (*op. cit.*) states that the temple of Concord was erected from the proceeds of the Gracchan confiscations. This is nowhere stated in the sources. If the confiscated property was treated, as similar property was later in the Sullan proscriptions, it was sold at public auction like booty taken in war. Now, Licinia, in case of a divorce could have sued her husband for the return of her dowry. In the case of his death, his heirs. To whom could she look for relief, when, by the confiscation of Gracchus' property, the *hereditas*, as far as it was material, was destroyed? Evidently to those to whom the estate was knocked down by the auctioneer, to Gracchus' successors in title.

But in this case the *res dotales* were no longer in existence. It was accordingly not a *fundus* that was concerned, but personal property. Appian tells us (i. 26): ὁ δὲ δῆμος αὐτῶν [sc. Γράκχου καὶ Φλάκκου] τὰς οἰκίας διήρπαξε. Appian means, to be sure, not the *dēmos* proper, the *plebs Romana*, but the hired thugs who formed the main part of the consul's forces, or possibly the non-Roman riff-raff of the city which seized the occasion to plunder. However that may be, the *res dotales* were gone. Licinia sues those who bid in the estate at the auction. Perhaps one man purchased it in bulk.¹ The defense is that the *res* have perished by accident. By a rule of law, the husband or his successors in title are liable for losses incurred by gross negligence or the various species of fraud comprised in *dolus*. The case goes before a iudex—in this case, the pontifex maximus, Publius Scaevola. His decision is that, as Gaius was primarily responsible for the riot in which the goods disappeared they were lost by his *culpa*, Licinia was, therefore, entitled to compensation from the estate.

The reasoning seems strained. As a matter of fact, the impartiality of Scaevola might easily be challenged. He was a blood-brother of Publius Crassus Mucianus, who had become by adoption a brother of Licinia and was, indeed, her quasiguardian after Gaius' death. Scaevola, himself, we remember as the drafter of Tiberius' landbills and as consul in 133 B.C. when he refused to countenance the illegal proceedings of the senate. That some utterances of his, afterward, indicated little real sympathy for the Gracchans, may have been shifty prudence or the caution of the trained legalist. This decision, probably, was a characteristic political move on his part.

We are not told when the case was decided. Evidently long before the reaction in favor of the Gracchi which sent Rupilius Popilius Opimius and others into exile, for the responsibility for the riot is placed on Gaius. We stated that she was a daughter of Decimus Brutus Gallaeus. The same statement is made in the *Liber Memorialis* of Ampelius (18, 4), probably from Nepos. Gaius may have married twice.

¹ Cf. the case of Antony when Pompey's property was sold (Cic. *Phil.* ii. 64). In the same oration (§ 62) Antony is called, to be sure ironically, the *heres* of Pompey.

cannot suppose that actual necessity impelled a woman living under the roof of the Crassus who was surnamed Dives, to sue for such meager personalty as could have been carried off or destroyed in a riot. We shall best understand the case as an attack on Gaius' enemies, directed by one to whom fine distinctions and forced interpretations were no new thing (cf. *De Leg.* ii. 53; Gellius 17, 7, 3). It qualifies our ideas of the orgy of violent repression, in which we are told Opimius indulged after the slaughter on the Aventine to know that the ordinary processes of law might be instituted against the victors, and that the pontifex maximus, as iudex in a private case, did not hesitate to defy the resentment of a party, already impatient of his precision, (cf. *Plut. Tib. Gr.* 19, 3; *Val. Max.* 3, 2, 17) by a strained application of a rule of law.

MAX RADIN

NEWTON HIGH SCHOOL
NEW YORK CITY

NOTES ON JUVENAL

In the *Classical Review*, XXVI, 22, Professor Paul Nixon briefly discusses Juvenal 7. 127-28 and 8. 4-5. In both passages, he says, Juvenal is really seeking to draw a picture of grandeur, of wealth and high position; into both passages he injects incongruous elements, by introducing epithets which suggest rather dilapidation: *curvatum, lusca, dimidios umerosque minorem*. In both passages, then, Juvenal to some extent defeats his own intentions; "In neither case is the poet able to refrain from irrelevant sarcasm." I am not so sure that the sarcasm is irrelevant; in both cases the satirist is having his fling at the same point, that in the estimation of the general any appearance of gentility, however sorry, has weight.

But I prefer for the moment to accept Professor Nixon's point of view, and to cite some other passages of Juvenal more or less akin. In the third Satire Juvenal is arguing with might and main that there is no place in Rome for an honorable poor man. Examine now carefully 46-48:

me nemo ministro
fur erit atque ideo nulli comes exeo, tamquam
mancus et extinctae corpus non utile dextrae.

The satirist implies that every provincial governor and every *comes* of such a governor is a *fur*: hence he himself will never be *comes* of a governor. All this occurs in a lamentation of the difficulty of getting on at Rome! Hence it is clear that Juvenal is saying in effect, most illogically, "I am an honorable man and so I never get a chance—confound it—at dishonorable gains!

In 1. 139-40 we have

Nullus iam parasitus erit! Sed quis ferat istas
luxuriae sordes?

parasitus is a fine *παρὰ προσδοκίαν* for *cliens* (cf. 126-38, and especially the mention of *clientes* in 132; in 132-34 throughout *clientes* is subject). Now, Juvenal in *Nullus iam parasitus erit!* is dealing with a grievous calamity. But, since he is repeatedly a sophisticated rhetorician lost in the exuberance of his own verbosity, or, to paraphrase Friedlander's admirable account, in his *Einleitung*, 48-50, has extraordinary tangential capacity, he passes at once to *Sed quis . . . sordes*, with its very different tone. The whole passage, then, runs thus: "Soon, oh woe of woes, there will be no parasite (client)!—But thank the gods for that! no one could stand being a parasite (client)!"

It goes without saying, however, that Juvenal is not alone in allowing incongruous elements to slip into his verses. There are striking instances, for example, in Seneca's *Medea*: see my note on Seneca's *Medea* 350-60 in the *Classical Review*, XVII, 46. I noted there also that in writing *regio deserta siti* in *Aen.* IV. 42 Vergil had allowed his narrative instinct to betray him into introducing something out of place in his catalogue of the difficulties and dangers besetting Dido's realm, and that *soporiferum*, the epithet of *papaver* in *Aen.* IV. 486, falls under the same general category.

CHARLES KNAPP

COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY

ON ARISTOTLE'S *NICOMACHEAN ETHICS* vii. 7. 1149 b 31 ff.

The accepted text reads:

διὸ καὶ τὰ θηρία οὕτε σώφρονα οὕτε ἀκόλαστα λέγομεν ἀλλ' ἢ κατὰ μεταφορὰν καὶ εἴ τι (τι?) θῶς ἄλλο πρὸς ἄλλο διαφέρει γένος τῶν ζῴων ὅβρει καὶ σιναμωρίᾳ καὶ τῷ παμφάγον εἶναι· οὐ γὰρ ἔχει προαίρεσιν οὐδὲ λογισμὸν, ἀλλ' ἐξέστηκε τῆς φύσεως, ὥσπερ οἱ μαινόμενοι τῶν ἀνθρώπων.

I think that the context here requires us to read οὐδὲ ἐξέστηκε for ἀλλά. But whether I am right or not in that conjecture, there are difficulties in the passage which the accepted interpretations only gloss over.

Aristotle is demonstrating that ἀκόλαστος and σώφρων apply to animals. The γάρ clause gives the reason, and has as Andronicus Rhodius saw, no reference, of course, to the virtual parenthesis ἀλλ' ἢ . . . εἶναι, which may therefore be provisionally ignored. The grounds, to anticipate, are briefly two: animals neither (1) possess deliberation nor reason, nor (2) can they even be spoken of as beside themselves or out of their (natural) wits like madmen. This reading yields the sense required by the context, and is subject to only slight objections, which will be explained away in the sequel. The received text sounds plausible, but is really impossible, I think. I see but one way to defend it. We may assume that γάρ does after all refer in very elliptical fashion to the clause ἀλλ' ἢ . . . εἶναι. The meaning then would be that exceptionally lewd or voracious animals may be metaphorically spoken of as ἀκόλαστα like madmen, because they do not possess reason but have

degenerated from nature. This, however, is a desperate remedy, for it assumes that normal animals possess *προαίρεσις* and *λογισμός*, which is not the fact, and which Aristotle denies by implication in the next sentence: *ἔλαττον δὲ θηριότης κακίας (κακόν) φοβερώτερον δέ· οὐ γὰρ διέφθαρται τὸ βέλτιστον, ὥσπερ ἐν τῷ ἀνθρώπῳ, ἀλλ' οὐκ ἔχει.* That is, the savageness of the brute is less of an evil than moral turpitude, but a more terrible thing. For the best part is not corrupted, as happens in man, but (the creature) does not possess it. This is surely an affirmation that animals lack *λογισμός* and *προαίρεσις* altogether.

The commentators, modern and ancient, never quite face the difficulty.

Grant says: "It is not quite clear what is meant by *ἐξέστηκε τῆς φύσεως*." Fritsche gives no light. The Greek paraphrasts betray uneasiness. Aspasius writes: *ἀλλ' ἐξέστηκε, φησί, τῆς φύσεως, τουτέστιν ἵσκει τοῖς ἐξεστηκόσι τῆς φύσεως καὶ μαινομένοις τῶν ἀνθρώπων*, and this is virtually Grant's explanation. The *Anonymus* says: *οὐ τοῦτό φησιν ὅτι ἔξω τῆς φύσεως τοῦ ἀλόγου ἐγένοντο καὶ λογικὴν φύσιν ἔλαβον, ἀλλ' ὅτι τὰ θηρία ἰοῖκασιν τοῖς ἐξεστηκόσι τῆς φύσεως ἥτοι μαινομένοις.* Heliodorus paraphrases *ἀλλὰ πάντῃ τῆς φύσεως ταύτης ἀφέστηκεν, ὥσπερ οἱ μαινόμενοι τῶν ἀνθρώπων* and this is the interpretation of Andronicus Rhodius, who uses the same words. Stewart (II, 186) comments thus:

ἐξέστηκε τῆς φύσεως, ὥσπερ οἱ μαινόμενοι τῶν ἀνθρώπων—Ramsauer is wrong, I think, when he makes *τοιαῦτα γένη τῶν ζῴων* the subject of *ἐξέστηκε*, and adds—"Cogitatur igitur generalis quaedam omnium animalium sana natura, a qua nonnulla genera (παρὰ φύσιν) degeneraverint." The subject of *ἐξέστηκε* is the same as that of *ἔχει* in the line above—viz., *τὰ θηρία*—all brutes generally, and the meaning is that the normal condition of brutes resembles that of madmen in being without the consciousness of those limits which define the 'nature' of rational beings. The term *φύσεως* must be regarded as coloured by its proximity to *προαίρεσιν* and *λογισμὸν*, just as *φυσικαί* above is coloured by its proximity to *ἀνθρώπιναί*.

Stewart then cites the *Paraphrase* and the *Aldine Scholia*.

Burnet (p. 317) comments as follows: "*ἀλλ' ἐξέστηκε κ.τ.λ.* This goes closely with *εἰ τι ὅλως διαφέρει κ.τ.λ.* The negative sense of *διαφέρει* justifies *ἀλλά*. The meaning is that exceptionally lascivious, destructive, and omnivorous *γένη* are *παρὰ φύσιν* or *τέρατα*. For the phrase *ἐξίστασθαι τῆς φύσεως* in this sense, cf. *Hist. An.* 488 b 19 *γενναῖον τὸ μὴ ἐξιστάμενον ἐκ τῆς αὐτοῦ φύσεως*, *Rhet.* 1390 b 28 *ἐξίσταται τὰ εὐφῶ γένη εἰς μαινώτερα ἦθη*. Aristotle is thinking, then, of animals that have "run wild" or degenerated. He cannot mean to say that all brutes *ἐξέστηκε τῆς φύσεως*, as Stewart says."

But all these renderings either attribute impossible meanings to words or evade the main difficulty. *Ἐξέστηκε τῆς φύσεως* does not mean *ταύτης τῆς φύσεως* nor *ἵσκει τοῖς ἐξεστηκόσι*. And *ἐξέστηκε* cannot mean *πάντῃ ἀφέστηκεν* in the sense proposed. It is uniformly employed by Aristotle to denote not the total original absence of a quality, but the defection or

degeneration from it, the loss of it by deterioration or temporary *ἵστασις*. His employment of the word may be illustrated by Cicero *De Finibus* ii, 11. 33. "bestiarum vero nullum iudicium puto. quamvis enim depravatae non sint, pravae tamen esse possunt"; and by Eusebius *Praep. evang.* vi. 10. 4: καὶ ἦν πολλὰ εἶδη ἐκθίσθαι ἡμῖν τῶν ζώων ἅτινα τῆς φύσεως μὴ δυνάμενα ἑκστῆναι πολὺν θανυσμὸν παρασχεῖν ὑμῖν εἰδύνατο.

Burnet's examples do not, I think, justify his interpretation. The first, *Hist. animal.* 488 b 19, is a general definition of *γενναῖον* and has little relevance. The passage *Rhetor.* 1390 b 28 does not refer to animals at all but to families of men, and merely says that the degeneracy of the clever families leads to instability and excitability of temperament—madness, in short. But I find no evidence that Aristotle did speak or could have spoken of whole species of animals as *παρὰ φύσιν* or *τέρατα*. Nor have the species of which he is thinking "run wild" or degenerated. They are wild by nature, and the suggestion that they have "run wild" is merely an unconscious endeavor to lend plausibility to the meaning assumed by Burnet for *ἐξέστηκε* here. He is right in his final statement that Aristotle cannot mean to say that all brutes *ἐξέστηκε τῆς φύσεως*, and that is what necessitates some such emendations as that which has been proposed.

Aristotle's meaning, then, is that madmen may in a sense be said to be not *σώφρονες* or sound-minded because they have lost reason; animals may not, except by a still bolder and different metaphor because they never had it to lose.

But it will be said that Aristotle does not regard mad men either as in the proper ethical sense of the word *ἀκόλαστοι*. That is true, and it is an objection to the proposed reading, but not, as we shall see, an insuperable one. Strictly speaking, the *ἀκόλαστος* or licentious man is he who in full possession of deliberative reason pursues the pleasures of the *ἀκρατής*, the incontinent, because the corruption of his (moral) nature sets before him a wrong *τέλος*. And the madman who has lost reason is like the brute, *ἀκόλαστος*, only in the metaphorical sense. But this subtlety is not and could not be consistently observed. In the last analysis the *ἀκόλαστος* himself owing to his judicial blindness ([μὴ] *ὀρθοδοξεῖν περὶ τὴν ἀρχήν*) has been deprived of right reason (1151 a 19). Aristotle recognizes that in common parlance *ἀκρατής* and *ἀκόλαστος* are often synonyms (1145 b 16) and practical ethics is perhaps more concerned with the two kinds of *ἀκρασία* called *ἀσθένεια* and *προπέτεια* according as the incontinent act is or is not accompanied by (the opportunity for) deliberation (1150 b 19). Now the incontinent under stress of sudden or overwhelming desire are (like madmen) *ἑκστατικοί* (1151 a 1) and this use of *ἑκστατικός* *παρὰ τὸν ὀρθὸν λόγον* is loosely extended to include also the other kind of incontinence, *ἀσθένεια*, where deliberation is possible but reason is overcome in the end (1151 a 21, 1145 b 10). Thus *ἑκστατικός* is carelessly employed for these three kinds of failure of reason: (1) madness, (2) *ἀκρασία* due to surprise of irresistible

πάθος, (3) ἀκρασία generally where reason yields even after deliberation to ἐπιθυμία or πάθος. The only case which it does not cover is the ultimate metaphysical problem of the obscuration of reason in the ἀκόλαστος in relation to the right apprehension of the τέλος. In this general sense of the words, then, Aristotle could say that animals are not properly σώφρονα or the reverse, because they neither have reason nor have lost it, ἐξέστηκε. The addition ὥσπερ οἱ μαινόμενοι is precisely the kind of careless writing that meets us throughout Aristotle. It directs our attention to the more specific meaning of ἐξέστηκε or ἐκστατικός when only the broader meaning is in point. Or we may express the same criticism differently by saying that μαινόμενοι is an unfortunate illustration because though the incontinent are in a sense mad, and the madmen may more fittingly be denominated incontinent and licentious than the brute, yet strictly speaking the term ἀκόλαστος applies to neither.

UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

PAUL SHOREY

BOOK REVIEWS

Sappho und Simonides. Untersuchungen über griechische Lyriker, von ULRICH VON WILAMOWITZ-MOELLENDORFF. Berlin: Weidmann'sche Buchhandlung, 1913.

Professor Wilamowitz sacrifices his long-cherished design of editing the fragments of the Greek lyric poets to the more pressing if less attractive duties of the editorship of the inscriptiones Graecae. The present volume of studies he regards as a part payment in bankruptcy of his old debt. We should rather describe it, to follow up his metaphor, as the declaration of a big dividend, the cutting of a large and juicy "melon" for the international company of stockholders in his manifold interests.

The reviewer cannot undertake to criticize or even catalogue the wealth of instruction and suggestion packed in these three hundred and twenty-three pages. He can only give a general account of the topics treated and call attention to some of the most interesting new ideas and interpretations.

The introductory essay on personality glances at Wilamowitz' favorite Carlylean idea of the controlling influence of great men, but is mainly concerned with the historians' endeavor to comprehend and interpret the significant or typical personalities of Greek literature. Of Homer we know only the name, and, as Wilamowitz believes, the father-land, Smyrna. Hesiod displays a conscious personality, but as we know his environment only from his own writings we perhaps individualize him too much. The Bohemianism of Archilochus suggests Villon and Paul Verlaine. But he is distinguished from this type by the severe classicism of his form, and we do not know whether his moral recklessness is naïveté or calculation. Bacchylides possesses no personality. Pindar is the first man whose inner development we can follow. Plato deliberately conceals his personality. Sappho—the entire essay is mainly an introduction to Wilamowitz' reinterpretation of this most fascinating personality of all, which occupies the sixty pages of the two following studies. In brief, the true Sappho is the honored poetess and the noble womanly form of the Munich vase and the Platonic epigram, not the hetaera of Greek comedy nor the worse-than-courtesan of Gallic pornography. In justification of this faith Wilamowitz repeats and supplements Welcker's analysis of the tradition whose chief document is the Ovidian epistle. Then from a reinterpretation of the two great odes and the new fragments he draws a brilliant if partly divinatory picture of Sappho's school to which the daughters of the noblest families of Asia Minor and the Aegean resorted. The soul of her poetry is its expression of her inner relations to these pupils

—the pure and passionate woman's yearning for a more intense and lasting love than careless happy, selfish, youth here today and gone tomorrow, can return for the devotion of parent, teacher, or older friend. In her this sentiment that is neither *ἔρως* nor *φιλία*, but *ἔρως φιλίας*, the feeling known to some men and to so many solitary women, finds its perfect and consummate utterance for all time. Of this the misunderstood legend of her love for Phaon is a conscious or unconscious allegory. Phaon or Phaethon is "eve's one star," the bright cold beauty, unresponsive to the infinite yearning which its aspect awakens in the lonely heart. This association of ideas or feelings Wilamowitz illustrates not only by his well-known interpretation of Euripides' *Phaethon* but by references to Goethe and Frau von Stein, and the correspondence of Frau von Humboldt. An English reader would think rather of Keats's last sonnet, or Longfellow's only love-poem, "The Evening Star," or the lines spoken by Sappho in Swinburne's *Anactoria*:

Like me the one star swooning with desire
Even at the cold lips of the sleepless moon.

From these heights of feeling we drop with sudden descent to a critical and technical chapter on the dialectic forms of Lesbian lyric, with a warning to future editors against riding too hard the hobby-horse of Aeolic *ψίλωσις* and recessive accent.

The knightly Anacreon who fought the Thracians, the Anacreon whose statue stood near the statues of Pericles and Xanthippus and whose history may be divined from the possibly genuine epigrams, was early forgotten. The Anacreon of tradition, the Anacreon of the vases and the *Anacreontea* is the old bard of love and wine whose vers de société were sung like scolia at Athenian banquets. Wilamowitz interprets several of these "Kinder des Moments," and reconstructs in fancy the situations that may have given them birth. Common to the Lesbians and to the Ionians Archilochus and Anacreon is a direct lucidity and classic simplicity of style akin to comedy which Wilamowitz proceeds by means of well-chosen examples to contrast and compare with the sophisticated and alembicated style of choral lyric, dithyramb, nomos and tragedy.

The four studies of Simonides fill nearly a hundred pages. The first begins by reminding us that Simonides belongs to and formed his art in an older generation than that of his rival Pindar, and proceeds to study his style, his life and the origins of the anecdotal biographical tradition in the investigations of the scholars of the first two or three Hellenistic generations after 320. The second chapter, first published in 1898, reconstructs from Plato's *Protagoras* and interprets the scolon to *Scopas*. Plato's application to this poem of the hair-splitting distinctions between *γενέσθαι* and *εἶναι* is a conscious or unconscious sophism. Simonides' famous self-contradiction is an intentional self-correction for the emphasizing of his point that we must not expect perfection of man. οὐδέ μοι ἐμμελὲς τὸ Πιττάκειον νέμεται

means "verkehrterweise wird von mir das Wort des Pittakos anerkannt." Professor Wilamowitz still holds that the *Protagoras* was written before the death of Socrates, and that it is a poetic and dramatic picture of Athenian life from which it is idle to attempt to distil any philosophical significance or scientific result. The third section is also a reprint of the famous Göttingen essay on "Simonides der Epigrammatiker." To this is added as a fourth section a brief study of the pre-Alexandrian epigram with special emphasis on such epigrams as may possibly be attributed to Simonides at least in the sense that they were found in a Simonidean volume which Wilamowitz assumes to have existed. Simonides, he thinks, undoubtedly composed short symposiacal and occasional poems that in the broader sense may pass for epigrams though they never stood on a stone. The probable authenticity of the beautiful Geraneia epigram is assured, he thinks, by Callimachus' imitation. He reaffirms his emendation of τῆλε for τῆδε in the last line; and prints the text as follows:

ἡερίη Γεράνεια, κακὸν λέπας, ὠφέλεν Ἴστρον
τῆλε καὶ ἐκ Σκυθέων μακρὸν ὄραν Τάναιν
μήδε πέλας ναλεῖν Σκιρωνικὸν οἶδμα θαλάσσης
ἀγκεα νυφομένης ἀμφὶ Μεθουριάδος.
νῦν δ' ὃ μὲν ἐν πόντῳ κρυερὸς νέκυς, αἱ δὲ βαρεῖαν
ναυτίλῃν κενεοὶ τῆλε βοῶσι τάφοι.

Professor Mackail regards this as a real or imaginary inscription for a cenotaph. Professor Wilamowitz finds in it an occasional poem, the occasion of which he reconstructs as follows: Simonides walking over the Via Mala of Geraneia sees the corpse tossing in the waves below, and curses the mountain which hinders him from descending to give burial to the unknown, who now will be honored only by some far-away cenotaph. This is ingenious, but impairs the pathos of the poem as I have always felt it. The absence of the name does not, I think, forbid us to assume that Simonides knew the dead man, and sympathized with the grief of those who mourned at his empty grave—a motive of frequent occurrence in the anthology. To modern feeling, indeed, the ὃ μὲν whose reference we understand only too well is even more pathetic than the name would be. So in *In Memoriam* XVIII Tennyson writes:

'Tis well, 'tis something we may stand
Where he in English earth is laid.

And surely it is as cause of the shipwreck and death that the mountain is cursed, and not merely as hindering the recovery of the body. This connection of thought is implied in the use of νῦν δέ, as appears more explicitly in the οὐ γὰρ ἂν clause of Callimachus' imitation:

ὠφέλε μὴδ' ἐγένοντο θαλαί νέες · οὐ γὰρ ἂν ἡμεῖς
παῖδα Διοκλείδα Σώπολιν ἐστένομεν.
νῦν δ' ὃ μὲν εἰς ἀλὶ πον' φέρεται νέκυς, ἀντὶ δ' ἐκείνου
ὄνομα καὶ κενὸν σῆμα παρερχόμεθα.

My conception of the poem is roughly indicated in the following version, where I read, of course, ὠφελος and τῆδε:

Ah! would Geraneia thy mist-veiled foreland
Far from the cruel Scironian main
Looked out on the desolate steppes of the Norland
Where Tanais rolls through the Scythian plain,
Not here where Meluriad's rock is lifting
Its snow-strewn glens o'er the ruthless wave
Where *his* cold body is tossed and drifting
While we make moan at an empty grave.

The reading τῆδε and my free interpretation of it by "we" are justified I think by Callimachus' παρεχόμεθα and several epigrams of the anthology in which kinsmen or friends or passers-by look with grief or sympathy on the empty grave. Cf. *Anth. Pal.* vii. 652; vii. 497, etc. In most, I think all, of such cases the deictically indicated cenotaph is the center of reference of the poem.

It is impossible to abbreviate further the closely reasoned argument for the existence of three poets claiming the name Stesichorus, or the discussion of their dates and relations to the extant fragments. Wilamowitz no longer shares the view that Stesichorus strongly influenced the development of the heroic legends before Simonides and Pindar. His conclusion seems to be "ignoramus" though not necessarily "ignorabimus." We must pass over the interesting and instructive interpretation of Pindar's Abdera paean, and Solon's Elegy εἰς ἑαυτὸν. The studies entitled "Mimnermos und Properz," and "Horaz und die griechischen Lyriker" are reprints. Although Professor Wilamowitz disclaims the intention of editing the Greek lyric poets, he has in fact in this volume edited, translated, and interpreted no inconsiderable portion of their text in a fashion which it will not be easy for any future editor to better.

PAUL SHOREY

Grundzüge und Chrestomathie der Papyruskunde. Von L. MITTEIS und U. WILCKEN. 4 Teile. Leipzig-Berlin: Teubner, 1912. M. 40.

It might occur to the busy reviewer that this, the first work to do for the non-literary papyri what Dittenberger's *Sylloge* did for the Greek inscriptions, has two parts, one historical and the other legal, largely because of the accident that of its editors one is primarily a historian and the other primarily a jurist. This initial impression might then be confirmed by the publisher's announcement that each part, and, indeed, each half of each part, is complete in itself and may be purchased separately. The idea of having to do with two chrestomathies and not with one might further seem to the hasty critic a nuisance: he might regret not to find the legal documents distributed under

their proper historical captions, and the work reduced by the omission of duplicates or enriched by wise substitutions. He would, however, be in error if he persisted in this prejudgment. For while all the documents in the two volumes have some historical interest and some of the most valuable historical records, like the famous edict of Caracalla of 212 A.D., appear only in the *juristischer Teil*, so considerable a group of the texts selected, and, indeed, so large a mass of all the papyri thus far discovered, are intelligible only when construed in terms of law and procedure that their segregation is anything but accidental or undesirable. We ought, in any case, to rejoice that the first aids to the interpretation of papyri—the so-called *Grundzüge*—are twofold, substantial and formal, and that it has been found possible to combine in a single work the rich experience of a historian and a jurist, both of whom are not textbook-makers, but second to none in the department of papyri-studies which they respectively represent. After the English dioscuroi, Grenfell and Hunt, there are no names more renowned in the brief annals of papyrology than Wilcken and Mitteis.

The student of private law will be able to do his work, if he wishes, with the second part of the chrestomathy alone. The historian fares less well, since he must go outside the volume apportioned to him for many of his most significant documents. Neither of them can dispense with either part of the *Grundzüge*, since the study of the papyri, with whatever end it may be undertaken, cannot be prosecuted to advantage without the explanations presented in the two parts. These two volumes are a golden bough to the explorer of what has hitherto been a particularly gloomy inferno. They transform spirits chattering in an exasperatingly familiar yet incomprehensible jargon into rulers with formulae, clerks with schedules, scribes with abbreviations, priests with rituals, peasants with solecisms, and others with intelligible idiosyncracies. We are taught by these books to converse readily with the shades of men that once lived in a strange but real world.

Hitherto the only possible approach to the papyri has been through the commentaries to the successive publications of texts. These, as is well known, are mainly the work of a small number of experts. The circle for which they are intended is a small one and of late its members have been much overworked. The future of papyri-studies depends upon the getting of new recruits, for whose instruction, however, the commentaries are altogether unsuitable. It does high credit to the organizing talent of Ulrich Wilcken that he created first a central organ for specialists in his *Archiv für Papyrusforschung* and now (with his colleague Mitteis) a course of study for beginners.

The entire work is opened by the introduction to Wilcken's part of the *Grundzüge*, on bibliography, script, language, chronology, money, metrology, and like matters. Then four horizontal periods are distinguished—the Ptolemaic, Roman, Byzantine, and Arabic—and briefly characterized in a general historical sketch—the first chapter of Wilcken's *Grundzüge*. This

is illustrated by the first chapter of his chrestomathy. Thereafter follow both in chrestomathy and *Grundzüge* eleven further chapters: ii, "Religion and Worship"; iii, "Education"; iv, "Financial Administration"; v, "Taxation"; vi, "Industry and Commerce"; vii, "Agriculture"; viii, "Socage and Liturgies"; ix, "Commissariat and Requisitions"; x, "Postal and Transport System"; xi, "Army and Police"; xii, "Aus dem Volksleben." In each case the topics are treated and the accompanying texts arranged chronologically, the four great periods being distinguished so far as possible. Mitteis' method is similar, the twelve chapters of his *Grundzüge* and chrestomathy being entitled: i, "Prozessrecht der Ptolemäerzeit"; ii, "Römischer Kognitionsprozess"; iii, "Die Urkunde"; iv, "Das Grundbuch"; v, "Schuldverschreibungen und Pfandrecht"; vi, "Kauf"; vii, "Grundstückpacht"; viii, "Eherecht"; ix, "Erbrecht"; x, "Vormundschaft"; xi, "Verschiedene Rechtsgeschäfte"; xii, "Gesetze."

These divisions are natural and helpful, though, on occasion, a single document, notably the *protagmata* of Euergetes II of the year 118 B.C., is divided not only between the two chrestomathies, but also among several chapters in each. In any case this particular papyrus could not be printed in its entirety in a chrestomathy. Hence, whoever wishes to have it all together must inevitably consult the *Tebtunis Papyri*. The work under review is not a substitute for the monumental publications but a guide to their proper use.

The *Grundzüge* aims at more than this, however. The authors have endeavored to put in concise form the net yield of papyri-studies to the historical sciences, of which, as Wilcken properly insists, papyrology is simply a handmaid. And in this aim they have succeeded so admirably that all specialists are bound henceforth to make it fundamental for their work. Nowhere else can one find the conclusions and problems arising out of the papyri stated so clearly and at the same time so cautiously. On almost every page of Wilcken's *Grundzüge* suggestions occur for hopeful investigations.

I have found it impossible to test the accuracy of the authors' work as editors in more than a few instances. There, however, the results were quite satisfactory. The text seems surprisingly free from errors of printing and transcription, and it is conservative in matters of conjecture and restoration. It is generally offensive to the eye, but that is because of the multitude of brackets with which papyrology operates. Wilcken and Mitteis have no special responsibility for the fact that a page of their chrestomathy looks like the page of an algebra. A glance at Capps's *Four Plays of Menander* shows how they might have helped to eradicate a bad custom.

The introductions to the texts, of which there are in all 822, 382 being legal, are generally brief but ample. They consist of a significant title, a complete bibliography, and just enough narrative to explain the situation presupposed by the document. The footnotes, on the other hand, are few,

and, as a six months' trial has convinced me, insufficient for novices. Even in the publications of Grenfell and Hunt, which are intended for scholars, more corrections of misspelled words and misused cases, tenses, forms, and pronouns are given than in this chrestomathy for beginners. The footnotes supplied by Wilcken and Mitteis are good, but there should be more of them.

It may be taken for granted that all who have a professional reason for knowing the papyri—I mean the historian, philologist, theologian, and jurist—will henceforth make the acquaintance of their subject through this work. It deserves, however, a wider public. The lover of Greek literature is less happily situated than the lover of Greek art. He has nothing by which to control his appreciation of his masterpieces comparable with the vase-paintings, tombstones, gems, terra cottas, frescoes, and *graffiti* which relieve the works of Pheidias and Praxiteles from their splendid isolation. The papyri bring him nearer to the natural mode of expression of the generality of Greeks than any other extant writings. They are at the same time the most intimate revelation we possess of the common acts and thoughts of men who, though resident in a foreign land among an alien people and themselves oftentimes *metis*, are yet near enough to the ancient Greeks to make those teachers of the classics who ignore their ways and ideas do so at their own peril. The time is past when the ancient world lays its rich stores of human experience before all men of cultivation. But such of them as can still read Greek will find many things in this collection of petitions, letters, court records, marriage contracts, wills, official reports, and odds and ends to chuckle over, to wonder at, and to move them to pity and reflection.

W. S. FERGUSON

Les institutions militaires de l'Égypte sous les Lagides. Par JEAN LESQUIER. Paris: Leroux, 1911. Pp. xviii+381.

The preface of this book is dated in October, 1908, the *addendum* in December, 1909, and the title-page in 1911. An interval of two or three years between the printing and the publication of a book exposes an author to serious risk, especially in a rapidly advancing subject like papyri studies. In this case, for example, M. Lesquier has been unable to use Rostowzew's epoch-making *Studien zur Geschichte des römischen Kolonates*, notwithstanding that it deals very closely with his theme and was issued in 1910. In another respect, too, the author rests at a disadvantage when compared with his critics: he was unable to use the *Grundzüge* of Wilcken and Mitteis, which was printed in July–August, 1911. We hasten to add, however, that his general position is strengthened rather than weakened by the unseen work of his distinguished German contemporaries.

The need of a treatise like *Les institutions militaires de l'Égypte sous les Lagides* is best proven by the reluctance with which Wilcken in his *Grundzüge* attacks the subject without it. "Nur ungern," he says, p. 382,

"behandle ich daher jetzt den Stoff, doch darf wenigstens ein kurzer Überblick hier nicht fehlen." The earlier works by Paul Meyer and Schubart were premature; yet upon them the best summarization hitherto accessible—that of Bouché-Leclercq in his standard *Histoire des Lagides*—was largely dependent. A detailed study, based upon an exhaustive examination of the papyri, into the sources, organization, distribution, and employment of the Ptolemaic soldiers, yields to M. Lesquier this general result, that for the first time we are in a position to understand the relations, and the changes of relations, between Macedonians and natives in Egypt. We come thereby very close to the secret of the strength and weakness of the Ptolemies.

In two notable particulars the practice of the early Ptolemies differed from that of the later. By both the standing army was farmed out; but the early kings kept it moving from dry or marsh lands, when it had reclaimed them, to other lands in need of reclamation, whereas the later kings let sons succeed fathers both in the army and in the farms which their parents' labor and money had redeemed. The penalty was that the army became immobile and ceased to add to the rent-paying domain of its master. The other notable difference consists not alone in the fact that a higher grade of military cleruchs, the so-called catoccs, appeared in the second century B.C. when lots were given to policemen as well as to soldiers, but also in the fact that the natives were then admitted freely to both services. M. Lesquier, indeed, thinks that the μάχιμοι were enrolled in the army from the beginning and that the much-discussed innovation of 218 B.C. involved the opening of the standing force to all classes of Egyptians. This seems to me unproven and unlikely. It implies the drawing of a distinction between the soldier caste and the other natives which must have been observable in many particulars had it really existed. To me it seems probable that the standing army of the Ptolemies was closed to the natives till the reign of Philopator. Their use on the fleet and in the transport service and occasionally in an army operating abroad was quite a different matter from keeping them continually under arms in Egypt itself. The proof of this contention is, moreover, found in the fact, established clearly by M. Lesquier, that after 218 B.C., and not before, the Macedonian and other foreign soldiers, despite the retention of their names and of their social, political, and economic status, were gradually absorbed by the natives.

Responsibility for this disastrous issue is fastened too closely by M. Lesquier on the moral and political sluggishness of Ptolemy Euergetes. It was, indeed, a serious matter that this much overpraised monarch kept his troops employed for the last twenty years of his life cultivating his lands in Egypt. His successor could bring them so incompletely into action that he was forced to call the natives to his assistance when attacked by Antiochus the Great. The important point seems to me to be this, that, despite the danger which their prompt mutiny disclosed, the later Ptolemies were unable to dispense with Egyptian soldiers because the loss of their empire in 202–200

B.C. cut them off from the districts from which their predecessors had been wont to draw their supply of new troops. The serious dependence of the domestic policy of the Ptolemies upon their foreign policy has not, I venture to think, been stressed sufficiently by M. Lesquier.

Three points noted at random will indicate how much this book offers to those who are not specialists in Egyptian history: (1) The normal infantryman's lot in Egypt contained thirty jugera, as did the holding of land given by Tiberius Gracchus to his new Roman soldiers. (2) The various *ethne* in the Ptolemaic army, like the Jews in Alexandria, were governed by their own laws. (3) The sons of the Ptolemaic military cleruchs—*οἱ τῶν ἐπικυρῶν*—played much the same rôle in the recruiting of the Ptolemies as the sons begotten by Roman soldiers from the women in the neighborhood of their camps—the so-called *ex castris*—played in providing the legions in the stationary *castra* with suitable candidates for some of their vacancies.

W. S. FERGUSON

The "Argonautica" of Apollonius Rhodius. Edited with introduction and commentary by GEORGE W. MOONEY, M.A. London: Longmans, Green & Co., 1912. Pp. 454.

Mr. Mooney is a pioneer. The *Argonautica* has been frequently translated into Latin, English, and other languages, but a commentary has not appeared for almost a century; and the exegesis in the editions of Hoelzlin, Shaw, Flangini, and Brunck-Schaefer is far inferior to the commentary provided for many other classical authors in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries. The present editor offers introductory chapters on the poet's life, the sources, the poem, other works of the poet, MSS, scholia, editions and translations; his text rests on no independent collations, but is apparently his own; his apparatus criticus is culled from Merkel and others with some additions from the critical studies of more recent years; an appendix deals with the question of double recension, and with meter; there are indexes of proper names, of Greek words treated in the notes, but not of subject-matter.

The purpose of the editor is not stated; we are not told whether he is addressing his work to scholars or to elementary students; he has provided a book that will immediately help the beginner in Hellenistic poetry and even the classical teacher who knows his Homer and Vergil, but has lacked courage to read Apollonius. Mr. Mooney, however, has made no effort to interpret, in the full sense of the term, either the poem or the poet. His introduction is a neat compilation of useful information; his notes give help in hard places, correct judiciously the translations of Way and others, the lexicons, and earlier editors, describe briefly Homeric and Apollonian usage, supply not a little in the way of parallel passages from earlier and contemporary poetry with the usual stock of material from Vergil and Valerius Flaccus, and explain allusions to people and places. The value of such

comment to the reader who is making his first acquaintance with the poet is clear; equally clear is the need, from a different standpoint, of a penetrating study of Apollonius' language and style not merely in comparison with Homer but with the *Koine*, of his art in comparison with that of Homer and Vergil, of all the many aspects of the poem,—for example, the legends, the topography, the relation of the third book to the romantic narratives of later days. The editor has wisely refrained from so ambitious an undertaking; his one volume would have grown beyond the limits of the publisher's endurance. We must, however, express some regret that Mr. Mooney shows no interest in these bigger things; so large a book might well reveal somewhere, if not always, a sense for the historical development of language or of literature; instead of this, we seldom get more than the pabulum of the schoolboy.

The textual apparatus is elaborate in comparison with that of the Oxford edition; it is compiled from earlier editions, chiefly Merkel's. The editor's thoroughness may be judged by the fact that, although about half a dozen papyrus-fragments of the *Argonautica* have been published since Seaton's edition, the apparatus never records them; this would be only a technical defect if the papyri contained no addition to our previous knowledge; but as it is, Porson's emendation in iii. 745 (which Mr. Mooney rejects) now has MS authority, Stephanus' reading of iii. 909 and Brunck's of iii. 263 are no longer merely emendations; furthermore, the condition of iii. 158 in the papyrus published in *Hermes* 35. 605 raises, perhaps, a new problem in the textual study of this verse; in any case, Gerhard need not have called his own emendation "tame and otiose": it now stands in a papyrus. Most of these papyri have appeared in the Oxyrhynchus series, which can hardly have been "unprocurable" at Trinity College. Mr. Mooney has printed at least three conjectures of his own (i. 517, 987, iv. 1647). He does not seem to have studied the textual difficulties, relatively few in Apollonius, very intensively: in iii. 882 he follows other editors in accepting Schneider's *ἀν*, but the MSS reading *αἰ* is supported by the existence of *οἱ δὲ δὴ ἄλλοι* and *αἱ δὲ δὴ ἄλλαι* as a tag at the end of verses in Apollonius (cf. e.g., iii. 872, 1170; iv. 334), and *ἄλσα* in the next verse is dependent upon the preceding verb of motion. In iii. 892 he prints the MSS reading, as does the Oxford text, but Mr. Seaton marked it corrupt; Mr. Mooney makes strange sense out of it; he is right in saying that *ἴμεν* is protected by 896; we may add to that part of his argument that we have noted (from Wellauer's index) eleven other examples of *ἴμεν* in the poem; in ten cases, as here, it forms the arsis of the first foot, or followed by an initial consonant laps over into the second foot; when we add to this, that in nine cases it is preceded by a verb of motion, and in six of these nine by the aorist of *βαίνω*, may we suggest putting a full stop after *ἐνόησα*, and beginning the next verse with *βῆν ἴμεν*, supporting the construction with *μετ' ἀνδράσιν* by Mr. Mooney's reference to i. 648 (though we do not fully share his view that this reference justifies the dative with *μετά* after a verb of motion). Again, in i. 103 Mr. Mooney reads with

the MSS and many editors κοινήν; but this would be the only case of κοινός in Apollonius against seven examples of ξυνός; κοινός is not the epic word, as Boesch showed; nor does Mr. Mooney's apparatus record that the scholia offer κείνην as a variant and that Boesch, perhaps rightly, restores it to the text.

It is easier to discover the sources of Mr. Mooney's commentary than of Apollonius' poem. His etymologies come from Curtius and Fick, his Homeric syntax from Monro, his general syntax from Goodwin. Of recent etymology we learn nothing; of Stahl, of Gildersleeve, of syntactical studies in Hellenistic Greek outside of the syntactical dissertations on Apollonius never a word. This can only mean that we shall find a comparison of the usage of Homer and of Apollonius, which is altogether desirable and helpful, but not an interpretation of the syntax and usage of Apollonius. Boesch interprets the forms in Apollonius; Mr. Mooney has used Boesch's dissertation, but contents himself with describing forms; might he not at least refer to the pages of Boesch if he cannot afford the space for real interpretation? Many an optative is noted and described in its relation to Homeric and classical Greek, but of the Hellenistic optative the editor reveals no knowledge. It is interesting that the accusative appears with *πειράζειν* in iii. 10 contrary to Homeric usage and to Apollonius' practice elsewhere, but the significant fact is that the verb takes the accusative in the New Testament. The information given is usually accurate and neatly condensed; but how may *ἵππερος* in ii. 1251 be equated with *κνέφας* in ii. 407 when the nominative *ἵππερος* in *Homeric Hymns* 18. 14 shows clearly the adjectival use? Would Mr. Mooney have denied the idiomatic use of *ἰδών* in ii. 606, if he had read Radermacher's discussion (*Philol.* 59. 596)? The editor has added much illustrative material in the form of parallel passages, both from his own reading and from the dissertations on Apollonius, most of which he seems to have assimilated; Hesiod and the *Anthology* he might have used to a greater extent without exceeding his allotted space; Apollonius' use of *ἄημαι* (note on ii. 81) should be compared with Hesiod *Scut.* 8, *Homeric Hymns* iv. 277; with *ὁμόλακες* (ii. 396) cf. *A.P.* vii. 402. 3; with *στεφάνης* (ii. 918) cf. *A.P.* vii. 482. 4, 488. 4; viii. 179; with ii. 933-34 cf. *A.P.* ix. 287. 3; with *γναθμοῖο κατασχομένη* (iii. 128) cf. *prehensa Cupidinis buccula*, *Apul. Met.* vi. 22; with *πολιοῖο* (iii. 275) cf. *A.P.* vii. 485. 1; with iii. 1374 cf. *A.P.* vi. 122. 3-4.

There are many passages in which the interpretation would easily lead to long discussion beyond the compass of a review, but in the main Mr. Mooney's interpretations seem to us sane. The large amount of geographical commentary might easily have been eliminated by including a map; by this means space could have been obtained for intensive study of some aspects of either the language or the style of the poem. As it is, the "sunbeam" in iii. 756 is not carried beyond the *Aeneid*; that Ovid and Aristaenetos and Dio Chrysostom also employed the figure may not interest the schoolboy, but

fills out the history of the famous simile. Literary appreciation Mr. Mooney seldom attempts; iii. 747 may be "one of the intensely human passages in Greek literature," but has it not also a taint of sensationalism that is truly Hellenistic? It is easier, however, to make reservations, corrections, and additions than it is to edit a Hellenistic poet who has long been neglected. Mr. Mooney has been courageous and, within well-defined limits, competent. He has made Apollonius accessible to a number of willing readers even if he has not contributed in any large measure to our knowledge of Hellenistic usage or of the many interesting aspects of Hellenistic poetry.

HENRY W. PRESCOTT

UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

Die sogenannten Sententiae Varronis. VON PETER GERMAN. III. Band, 6. Heft of Studien zur Geschichte und Kultur des Altertums, herausgegeben von E. DRERUP. Paderborn: Ferdinand Schöningh, 1910. Pp. 99. M. 2.80.

In the *Einleitung*, pp. 1-6, the author traces the history of our knowledge of these *sententiae*, from the publication of part of them in certain works of Vincent of Beauvais, 1250-54, to the recension of the full collection given, in 1865, by A. Riese, on pp. 265-72 of his *M. Terenti Varronis Saturarum Menippearum Reliquiae*. In this valuable bibliographical survey the views of all who in books or articles have examined the collection are given. As early as 1624, it appears, the Varronian authorship of the *sententiae*, apparently attested by the ascriptions in the MSS, was questioned, but no one had exhaustively examined the matter. As late as 1856, Chappuis, in his elaborate discussion, had positively ascribed the collection to Varro; Riese had held that the *sententiae* were in part at least derived from Varro. Teuffel-Schwabe⁶ (see Warr's translation, § 169. 2) and Schanz, I, 2^a, S. 450, were evidently not ready to deny absolutely the Varronian authorship, though Teuffel-Schwabe, after quoting five *sententiae* from the collection, said, "It is true that all these sayings remind us even more of Seneca in style and spirit."

There was, then, room for a definitive discussion of the *sententiae* with a view to determining, if possible, the authorship of the collection. To this end Germann, on pp. 7-29, deals with the interrelation of the MSS, as the basis of an authoritative text. The conclusions reached seem unassailable; the problems were, indeed, simple. On pp. 30-42 the text of the 158 *sententiae* is given, with an elaborate *apparatus criticus*, far more exhaustive and valuable than that in Riese. It seems regrettable, however, that the author did not indicate in his text, by typographical devices, departures from the MSS, and that he did not indicate, in a short *conspectus lectionum*, how far his text differs from Riese's. The differences appear, in fact, in only about fifteen places; in general Germann's text is the better.

On pp. 44-74 we have "Bemerkungen zu den einzelnen Sentenzen." The author evidently did not aim to write an exhaustive commentary; many interesting matters of syntax and vocabulary are passed over. Germann was concerned primarily with the thought of the *sententiae*; he adduces parallels from Varro, Cicero, Horace, Ovid, Publilius Syrus, and, above all, from Seneca the philosopher. Chappuis had already noted many parallels from Seneca without, however, realizing their bearing on the question of authorship; to these Germann adds largely. Valuable as this collection of parallels is, one gets the feeling that the author had early made up his mind that the main source of the *sententiae* was Seneca; at any rate he is most diligent in his quest for Senecan parallels. For example, on 138, *Citra perfectionem omne est principium*, he fails to cite such an elaborate foreshadowing of the idea as we have in Cicero Brutus 69-71 (cf. especially 71, *nihil est enim simul et inventum et perfectum*). Perhaps, too, not sufficient allowance is made for the proverbial character of much of the *sententiae* or for the fact that, since the prevailing philosophy of our collection is Stoic, of necessity most clear-cut parallels will be parallels with Seneca.

Pp. 75-84 deal with the sources. Here the hints scattered throughout the *Bemerkungen* are gathered together. Assuming that his collections of parallels is exhaustive (an unjustifiable assumption, I fear), Germann concludes that Varro is not the source or even an important source; there are few instances in which we can bring our *sententiae* into close and real connection with Varro's known words or thoughts. Again, not one author of all those who, down to the end of antiquity, derived their knowledge directly or indirectly from Varro, cites as Varronian a single *sententia* from our collection. The many parallels between our *sententiae* and Cicero, Germann explains as due to the similarity of the philosophical problems handled both by Cicero and the *sententiae*; besides, in these cases we can regularly cite parallels from other Latin authors: in a word, we are dealing merely with stock themes. There are points of contact between the *sententiae* and Horace, as with Ovid; once, in each case, there is use of the phraseology of these poets. There are more points of contact with Publilius Syrus; sometimes, where there is close resemblance in thought, there is also evidence of metrical form. On p. 79, however, Germann declares plainly his conclusion that "die Werke Senecas tatsächlich als Quelle eines beträchtlichen Teiles der Sammlung zu gelten haben." We have not only parallels in thought, but direct use of Seneca's words and phrases, at times in very different connections (p. 89); see the striking examples gathered on pp. 81-82. On the whole, in spite of my doubt concerning the exhaustiveness of the citations of parallels from authors other than Seneca, I think Germann has made out a case for Seneca as the chief source of these *sententiae*.

The concluding pages, 85-89, deal with the "Entstehung der Spruchsammlung." Here, because the author rightly refuses to indulge in speculation and sticks closely to the few things he can fairly claim to have proven,

we find little that is definite. Only *sententiae* 1-152, he holds, belonged to the original collection; to cite but one bit of evidence for this view, one MS shows a subscription after 152. Who the author was and when the collection was put together Germann does not attempt to say.

To sum up, we have an interesting book, whose chief merit, apart from its orderly presentation of material, the excellence of its method, and its resolute refusal to claim more than the evidence warrants, lies in the demonstration of the close parallelism, in thought and language both, between the *sententiae* and the philosophical works of Seneca. Thus the belief of Germann's more immediate predecessors in the Varronian authorship of the collection is disproved, and demonstration is made that Teuffel-Schwabe's connection of the *sententiae* with Seneca is, at the least, very much more than a mere guess. It may be added, finally, that the *sententiae* are far from uninteresting in themselves. One oft-repeated thought is that no teacher can be of much value or power who listens to others merely that he may repeat *audita*.

CHARLES KNAPP

COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY

Studi Graccani. By GIUSEPPE CARDINALI. Rome: E. Loescher & Co., 1912. Pp. iv+212.

This book contains four essays on the sources of the history of the Gracchi, the agrarian question in general, the provisions of the *lex Sempronia* and the history of its enforcement. Much has been written of late on this subject, and the critical acumen of the modern German school abundantly exhibited. Cardinali represents a somewhat more conservative tendency, and in discussing the sources of Gracchan history he takes issue with Meyer and Kornemann in particular in their assumption of a single source of the Latin tradition. He maintains that, while Posidonius is the source of the account in Diodorus and the *Auctor ad Herennium*, of the other accounts in Latin authors, in Plutarch and in Appian, there are three distinct Latin sources—the original Latin source of Appian, a pre-Ciceronian, and Livy. The last two appear fused in Valerius Maximus, Florus, Cassius Dio, and perhaps Velleius. The Livian tradition is quite foreign to Plutarch and the *Auctor ad Herennium*. In Plutarch we have the pre-Ciceronian and the original of Appian and perhaps others still.

Hardly any kind of investigation can lead to greater absurdities than that of sources, and Cardinali is to be congratulated on having exhibited more self-restraint and sanity of judgment than some of his predecessors. He refuses to accept Kornemann's Fannius, and does not attempt to eliminate entirely the element of individuality that may be found even in the most slavish of compilers. In general his criticisms are well taken, and his conclusions deserve careful attention. A good illustration of his skill in

argument is found on pp. 43-44, where he points out how impossible it would have been for any Roman in that stormy period to have risen so far above the strife of party as to write a wholly objective account of the struggle, which should afterward have been accepted as the only adequate source.

The second essay deals with the administration of the *ager publicus* before the Gracchan period, for the purpose of overthrowing Niese's contention that legislation fixing the amount of public land to be held by any individual dated only from a few years before 133 B.C., and formed no part of the Licinian laws of 367. Niese's view has been generally accepted, but Cardinali's discussion of the matter is keen, clear, and in the main convincing. He seems to have shown with reasonable certainty that some form of limitation was contained in the Licinian legislation.

In connection with the provisions of the *lex Sempronia*, Cardinali argues that *possessio* of the *ager publicus* had been enjoyed by *socii* as well as by *cives*, and that the process of confiscation of excess holdings by the state bore harder on the former than on the latter. He agrees with Lange and Beloch, against Mommsen, Kornemann, and Meyer, that *socii* did not participate in the new distribution.

In tracing the history of the *lex Sempronia*, Cardinali takes a position half-way between those who believe that the law was fully carried out, and those who think that, although the *ager publicus* was separated from that rightfully in the hands of individuals, little actual distribution took place. He also maintains with much plausibility that the *lex Thoria* of 111 B.C. was not a reactionary measure as is generally supposed.

S. B. P.

Thucydides, Book iv. Edited by A. W. SPRATT, M.A., Fellow and Tutor of St. Catherine's College, Cambridge. Cambridge: The University Press, 1912.

Book iv of Thucydides has been prepared on the same plan as Mr. Spratt's two other books in the "Pitt Press Series," namely Thuc. iii and vi. Below the text at the foot of the page are noted important variants, corrections, and conjectures—especially of Cobet, Hude, van Herwerden, Dobree, Rutherford, and others—although a complete *apparatus criticus* for the book has not been attempted. These footnotes are bare statements of fact. Brief arguments or discussions on disputed points of text are given, when deemed necessary, in connection with the explanatory notes, not reserved for a critical appendix at the end. In fact the appendix—only four pages—is devoted mainly to historical questions. The introduction, which is short—only ten pages—discusses "The Prelude to the Ten Years' War." The explanatory notes are very brief, as a rule, but consistently helpful. Admirable especially are those of an informational character, which on the first mention of an important place give a concise statement of

its previous history, with noteworthy literature bearing on the subject. See, e.g., the notes on Messene, Locri, and Rhegium in chap. 1. The same is true of the brief biographical notices on the first appearance of historical personages, as, e.g., that on Brasidas in chap. 11. Thucydidean usage is carefully noted everywhere. By this is meant (1) words apparently coined by Thucydides; (2) ἀπαιετοῖς or rare terms; (3) Ionic or poetic words and constructions; (4) peculiarities of Thucydidean syntax. The notes involving all such points show careful and constant use especially of the Classen-Steup commentary. But there is abundant evidence everywhere that Stahl, Shilleto, Krüger, Hude, Boehme-Widmann, Goeller, Bloomfield, Arnold, and Jowett were always consulted. The manifest object has been to give the reader the helps that are really necessary to understanding the text. Praiseworthy lucidity as well as brevity characterizes the notes, and the edition can be heartily recommended as an excellent one for school and college work. The indexes—Greek, 13 pages; English (including names and places) 8 pages, in double columns—are unusually full.

C. F. S.

UNIVERSITY OF WISCONSIN

Aristarchs Athetesen in der Homerkritik. By ADOLPH ROEMER.

Leipzig: Teubner, 1912. Pp. xii+528. M. 16.

This book is a continuation of the work of over thirty years in which the author has devoted himself with peculiar enthusiasm to the attempted discovery of the true Aristarchus. The results of all this labor are most distressing, since they apparently prove that the scholia in Ven. A, hitherto regarded of unique value in estimating the merits and defects of Aristarchus, are founded on ignorance and dishonesty, also that Aristonicus did not have the ability or the desire to interpret him truthfully, that Didymus was unable to comprehend the great Alexandrian, and lastly that the excerptor, who has preserved in part the comments of Aristarchus as mutilated by Aristonicus and Didymus, was himself ignorant, incompetent, and dishonest. Roemer groups these three, Aristonicus, Didymus, and the excerptor, under the heading "The perfidious and scandalous group of swindlers." How are we to reach the true original through this triple barrier of ignorance and imposture? The attempt is frankly impossible, but here and there certain indications may be found, chiefly in Eustathius, Porphyrius, and Townleanus B, with an occasional hint from Plutarch and Athenaeus, while the supposedly valuable scholia in Ven. A are to be ignored as entirely worthless. No work based on the reliability of Ven. A is of any value, hence this sad verdict on p. 501: "So wenig wie Lehrs hatte Cobet eine Ahnung von der Aristarchischen Exegese."

This book is most difficult reading and demands the widest study in the same field in order to be able to determine the worth of the arguments, a study

few or none besides the author himself could have made. By the most intricate and erudite comparison of scattered scholia, Eustathius, and Porphyrius, it is shown that Ven. A credits Aristarchus with the very theories which he vigorously fought. Two examples will suffice to show how false these comments of A are.

X 329: οὐδ' ἄρ' ἀπ' ἀσφάραγον μελίη τάμε χαλκοβάρεα,
ὄφρα τί μιν προτείποι ἀμειβόμενος ἐπέεσσιν.

to which Ven. A has the following: (α) ἀθετείται ὅτι γελοῖος εἰ ἡ μελία ἐπετήδενσε μὴ ἀποταμῆν τὸν ἀσφάραγον, ἵνα προσφωνήσῃ τὸν Ἀχιλλῆα. (β) ἀπολογούμενοι δέ φασιν, ὅτι τὸ ἐκ τύχης συμβεβηκὸς αἰτιατικῶς ἐξενήνοχεν (Ariston.). By a series of convincing proofs and parallels the author shows that this reading is a distortion of the following: (α) ἀθετείται [ὑπὸ Ζηνοδότου καὶ Ἀριστοφάνους], ὅτι γελοῖος κτλ. (β) [κακῶς · καὶ ἀντιλέγει δι' ὑπομνημάτων Ἀρίσταρχος] ὅτι τὸ κτλ. Aristarchus is thus charged with the errors of the very men whom he sought to refute. A second and more striking illustration is found in

Ψ 405: ἥτοι μὲν κείνοισιν ἐρίζεμεν οὐ τι κελεύω,
Τυδείδω ἵπποισι δαΐφρονος, οἷσιν Ἀθήνη
νῦν ὥρεξε τάχος καὶ ἐπ' αὐτῷ κύδος ἔθηκεν.

ἀθετοῦνται οἱ δύο · πῶς γὰρ τὸ ἐκ τῆς Ἀθηναῶν γερόμενον οἶδεν ὁ Ἀντίλοχος; καὶ τὸ Τυδείδω ἵπποισιν . . . δῆλον, ὅτι περὶ τοῦ Διομήδους ὁ λόγος A. Here, by the method followed in the previous example, Roemer shows the true reading should be: (α) ἀθετοῦνται οἱ δύο [ὑπὸ Ζηνοδότου καὶ Ἀριστοφάνους]. πῶς γὰρ κτλ. (β) [ἀντιλέγει δὲ δι' ὑπομνημάτων ὁ Ἀρίσταρχος, ὅτι ταῦτα ἀφ' ἑαυτοῦ ποιεῖ λέγοντα ὁ ποιητὴς τὸν Ἀντίλοχον.] Aristarchus was not the apostle of the law of analogy, but the opponent, and his position in practically all matters was the reverse of that implied in Ven. A. Thus the structure erected on these scholia by Cobet, Lehrs, and their followers crumbles.

Having removed the errors Roemer tries to give a revaluation of the work of the Alexandrians. His conclusions are as follows, though the foundations on which they rest are admittedly weak, since A is not to be regarded; Zenodotus had no conception of Homer or his times, and so accordingly tried to force him into the mold of a third-century philosopher, and ignoring tradition he emended or excluded verses at will; Aristophanes, though less radical, made no contribution to the appreciation of the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey*; Aristarchus was the first to grasp either the functions of an editor or the meaning of Homer. He saw that Homer belonged to a different world in culture, morals, and mythology; accordingly he did not try to fit Homer into the ideas of Alexandria, but let Homer interpret his own age, and advanced the true principle of explaining Homer from Homer. Aristarchus has never been surpassed in the ability and industry with which he investigated epic poetry. He was not understood, since a myth grew up about him that his

work was done under inspiration, whereas it was the fruit of careful and systematic observations. His work was a mystery to Aristonicus and Didymus, who failed utterly to comprehend the meaning or results of his labors, and their faulty transcripts or comments were in turn mutilated by an incompetent and indolent excerptor. The recovery of Aristarchus, without the discovery of new materials, is impossible.

The results of Roemer's studies are staggering and might well discourage anyone from studying the scholia to Homer, since it is impossible for any but the specialist to rectify a mistake or omission by the ready knowledge of Eustathius, Porphyrius, or outlying comments—comments not referring to the passage in question and whose meaning can be grasped only by the most shrewd combinations.

The importance of the author's work is such that there is a real need that all his writings in this field be collected into a single, compact volume. This is not an impossibility, since Professor Roemer's style is peculiarly adapted to condensation.

JOHN A. SCOTT

NORTHWESTERN UNIVERSITY

The Golden Latin Gospels in the Library of J. Pierpont Morgan. . . .

Now Edited for the First Time, with Critical Introduction and Notes, and Accompanied by Four Full-Page Facsimiles. By H. C. HOSKIER. New York: Privately Printed, MCMX.

This is a sumptuous and elaborate edition of the beautiful Gospels, written in golden letters on purple vellum, which formerly belonged to the collection of the Duke of Hamilton, and are frequently denominated "Hamilton 251." The present editor adopts the symbol p.

The volume contains an Introduction, of over 100 pages, devoted to a description of the manuscript, with detailed comparisons and discussions of other Vulgate MSS in connection with it. This Introduction is followed by Preliminary Remarks, giving different views as to the date and origin of the MS, and a careful, detailed description of the various hands to be distinguished in it, with peculiarities of each. And finally, we have the "Lectioes Variae," a list of peculiar readings, with comparison of a large number of other MSS, quotations from the Fathers, etc.

An Appendix deals with another biblical fragment \hat{M} in the Morgan library.

It is a pity that so important a book should be disfigured by the style in which the subject-matter is treated. A serious work for the use of scholars is not the place for the facetiousness and diffuseness which characterize Mr. Hoskier's discussions. His paragraphing is excessive and unsystematic; he often makes independent sentences out of subordinate clauses (e.g. pp. xcv,

cxii "Whereas," etc.); and too frequently lapses into colloquialisms. A few examples of this latter fault are: "isn't" (p. lxiv), "won't" (p. 58), "pretty good" (p. lxxviii), "friend K" (p. lx), "old friend D" (p. 47), sentences beginning "Well," (pp. cix, 41), and such use of adverbs as "diverge tremendously" (p. xli), "enormously tinged" (p. lx), "problem is terribly complicated" (p. lx), "we miss H terribly" in Mark (p. xxxix), "δ latinizes gloriously" (p. 23), etc.

The confusing tabulations of mere orthographic minutiae side by side with important variants seem to indicate the lack of a final revision and editing, in some parts of the work at least, which would have been highly desirable.

The meaning of the editor's punctuation is not always clear. To take a random case, where is one to find an explanation of the parenthetical marks placed around "Dimma μ" on p. 224, at Luke 11:12?

An example of unsound reasoning is found on p. cvii. Because four MSS omit a given word is no "proof" at all that one of them must have been the basis for the other three.

Mr. Hoskier is wrong in certain points which seem to him to indicate Irish or Anglo-Saxon origin for this MS "ziabolus" (p. xvii) is not especially Irish, nor is "haestis" for "estis" (*ibid.*), both being found in Spain, while "c" for "t" (*ibid.*) is no evidence of Irish origin (E.A. Loew, *Studia Palaeographica*, 1910). The accenting referred to on p. xvii is also Caroline. What evidence is there for his statement that CT, "even if written in Spain were apparently written under Saxon or Irish scribes"? Another error occurs on p. ciii, where he finds *p* agreeing with CT in reading "existimabo" [extimabo CT] in place of "aestimabo." Now the "extimabo" of the Spanish MSS is not equivalent to the "existimabo" of *p*, but is, on the contrary, equivalent to "aestimabo," since "aestimabo" and "extimabo" would have been pronounced alike in Spain. Consequently there is no real agreement here. "ius" for "justos" (Luke 5:32) is not an abbreviation, and there is no reason to criticize Traube for not citing it.

In this matter of abbreviations, Mr. Hoskier has passed much too lightly over a most important department. Nowhere does he bring together and classify the abbreviations found in the text, nor draw conclusions from them as regards date or place of writing. And it is well known to students of paleography that these furnish evidence of weight on such matters.

Mr. Hoskier's collations are in the main very accurate. Comparison of his facsimiles with his collation of the parts reproduced shows only one or two minor slips: e.g. in Plate I, col. a, l. 1, the MS reads "illi" for "illis": this is omitted in the collation of Matt. 10:29. In Matt. 10:42 (p. 95) Mr. Hoskier reads "agriē" with a cedilla under the "e." No cedilla is visible in the facsimile (Plate I, col. b, l. 16).

Occasional corrections of Wordsworth and White testify to the carefulness with which Mr. Hoskier has gathered and compared his material.

The MS itself is written in a beautiful uncial hand (or hands) on purple vellum of varying shades. Mr. Hoskier is undoubtedly right in distinguishing the writing of many different scribes in the course of the four Gospels. They vary not only in their formation of letters, but in their accuracy of copying, and in a number of peculiarities. One interesting point is the frequent omission of u after q. There are several places where no explanation save that of ordinary carelessness will suffice to account for the reading. Such are, among others, "regunt" for "resurgunt" (Luke 7:22), "rentare" for "renuntiare" (Luke 9:61), "supervenerens" (Luke 11:22), "invens" for "inveniens" (Luke 11:24), "po" for "post" (Luke 12:5), "va" for "vapulabit" (Luke 12:48), "sgnum" for "signum" (Luke 21:7), and "habebanut" for "habebant" (Matt. 13:5, 6).

The question of the handwriting leads naturally to a consideration of the place and time of the production of the MS. Mr. Hoskier believes and argues vigorously that it must have been written in England by English or Irish scribes, and dates it at the end of the seventh or the beginning of the eighth century (p. xi). He would have it (with Wattenbach) that this is the same purple and gold manuscript which tradition tells us was made at the bidding of Wilfred, archbishop of York (667-709), and that it is perhaps "the only specimen of a purple and gold MS produced within the borders of England or Ireland" (p. xiv). In no other way can he account for the appearance of certain forms, such as the Irish z, the peculiar and beautiful U, the uu (w), the dotted y, the "carry-up," the accenting of certain phrases, and the agreement with such well-known Irish MSS as DELR, the book of Moling, and others.

In spite of his assertion that his "case is absolutely proved" (p. 8), there still remain grounds for serious doubts as to the correctness of his conclusions. His own admission that "Palaeographically speaking, p is in a class by itself as regards English and Irish MSS" (p. xv) casts doubt on his theory and the weakness of many of the arguments by which he supports his contention will appear after a little study. Berger speaks the truth when he says that no competent judge would decide on a British origin merely from the Irish or Saxon elements which are to be observed in the MS [*Hist. de la Vulg.*, p. 261]. Irish and Saxon scribes and texts were so numerous in the kingdom of Charlemagne, that the presence of such peculiarities of handwriting need not stand for a moment in the way of the assumption of a Caroline origin. The "w" is to be found outside of England, and Hoskier himself says (p. xv) that no other example of it is known earlier than 800 A.D. Even granting that our form of the U is not (elsewhere) found on the continent at all (p. xv), we are not thereby forced to admit that it could not have been written by Saxon scribes in the north of France. And such peculiarities as the "carry-up," an Irish custom, and the Irish z, are amply accounted for by the hypothesis of Irish scribes on the continent. Nothing in the form of the letters necessarily restricts us to a

British origin, and there is evidence that it is really a production of the age of Charlemagne. The uncial writing looks Carolingian at first glance. An interesting peculiarity which Mr. Hoskier minimizes is the almost invariable use of the capital "Q" rather than the small form "q." This is a mark of lateness. The early uncial manuscripts use the small "q" freely, while the more artificial hand of the Carolingian revival tends to the use of the "Q" form, as found in our MS. The separation of the LL, while not conclusive, is also evidence in favor of a later date than 700. Further, the lack of any characteristically Irish abbreviations is best to be explained on the ground that it was written for readers who were not entirely accustomed to such abbreviations. There is not a single example of the Irish signs for "autem" or "enim," which are common in all real Irish MSS. Finally, it may be mentioned that not only Berger, but Edward Maunde Thompson and Ludwig Traube, two of the most eminent and learned specialists in paleography, agree in regarding this MS as Carolingian [Thompson *Handbook of Greek and Latin Palaeography*, p. 41; Traube *Vorlesungen und Abhandlungen*, I, 119]. Lindsay, in a private letter to Professor C. U. Clark, expresses the same view.

As regards the text to be found in *p*, its relation to other MSS, and the probable course of its transmission, we have a difficult problem. One cannot attempt to establish the exact relation of this MS to the other Vulgate MSS without long and detailed study of the critical apparatus, backed by a wide knowledge of other MSS, and their relations to each other. But there are a few points which may be mentioned as suggesting what influences may possibly have been at work to form such a text as his. Mr. Hoskier well speaks of the text in its present form as having been "compiled" (p. xcix).

In the first place it is plainly evident that somewhere in the course of text tradition leading up to *p*, one or more Irish MSS have been employed (Berger *op. cit.* 261). This is indicated by the frequent and striking similarities which exist between our MS and many of the principal Irish MSS. A few cases out of many are: Luke 9:54; 23:28; John 1:34; 13:26, p. 32; 20:19, etc. Another interesting point is in the treatment of the adverbs "autem," "enim" and others. "Autem," for instance, is frequently omitted, in passages where such omission is unique, as in Matt. 17:26; 19:9 Luke 7:20; John 18:5, 15, etc. Sometimes "enim" is omitted, as in Matt. 18:11; Luke 12:2; 21:8, etc. Again, confusion seems to exist where we have "autem" for "vero," Matt. 19:14, or "vero" for "autem," Matt. 26:58, or "autem" for "ergo," John 4:52, or "autem" for "enim," Matt. 7:29 or "ergo" for "enim," John 5:13. Such readings as these seem most satisfactorily explained on the hypothesis that at one time or another, or at different times, during the transmission of the text, some Irish manuscript, with the characteristic Irish abbreviations, was used as a source, and that these abbreviations were not always clear to the copyist, being sometimes omitted and sometimes confused. The orthography also frequently shows

Irish influence, as in the reducing of double to single letters, as "eset," Luke 22:23, "saculum," Luke 22:36; "acusarent," Luke 6:7, "dinitere," Luke 4:19, "egresus," Mark 8:27, etc.

Traces of Spanish influence are also visible. The parent text may have been corrected from a Spanish MS. The most striking examples of this are to be seen in the addition of an initial "h," which occurs not infrequently. Thus we have "honera," Matt. 23:4, "hedis," Matt. 25:32, "habiit," (with C), John 10:40, "hibi," Luke 6:6, "holiveti," Luke 19:29, "hodit" (with C) John 12:25; cf. also "abenti," Luke 19:26, "ortus" (for "hortus"), John 18:1, etc.

We may perhaps also be justified in suspecting the existence of a parallel correction, of our MS. In Mark 11:33, we have "ei" for "Iesu": unique among Latin versions, but having Greek authority. Similarly in Luke 20:1, the omission of "in templo" is paralleled in Greek, though not in Latin, MSS of the Gospels. There is Greek authority also for "ad illos," in place of "illis" in Luke 3:14.

We may offer the following, then, as a conjectural account of the text of p. Originally based on a very old Latin version (for, as Mr. Hoskier shows, there are many points of agreement with the old MS "a"), it was influenced by the Greek text, copied by Irish scribes, perhaps corrected once by a Spaniard, and finally recopied, under Charlemagne, into its present form.

In summary, the book, though containing some faults of style and some, we think, erroneous conclusions, is a valuable edition, and deserves praise. The MS p itself is a very interesting one, and should have further, study, with a view to clearing up, if possible, the disputed points in connection with its origin, and to showing, as far as may be, its proper place as regards its text. For such investigations Mr. Hoskier's work will furnish an excellent starting-point.

ARTHUR H. WESTON

Wahrheit und Kunst Geschichtschreibung und Plagiat im klassischen Altertum. Von DR. HERMANN PETER. Leipzig-Berlin: B. G. Teubner, 1911. Pp. xii+490.

The title selected for his volume by the erudite author might suggest somewhat unrelated essays gathered together for convenience of publication, prefaced with a statement of the conventional sort designed to exercise the imagination of the reader in a vain effort to discover the alleged thread of logical connection between them. Quite the contrary, however, is true: for what Dr. Peter presents is the drama, or if you will, the tragedy of Truth enacted in the course of ancient historiography, in five acts as follows: the slow and labored travail of her birth, retarded by religious and moral ideals which found their fulfilment in creations of beauty; her youthful vigor,

championed by philosophers, and brought to maturity by Herodotus and Thucydides; her eclipse through the frivolous devotion of the Sophists to the specious, and the desire to delight and entertain cultivated in the schools of rhetoric; her deliberate betrayal by the historians of Alexander, who aimed in part to flatter the king and in part affected the marvelous for the sake of winning popular approval; finally, her all but absolute extinction under the dead weight of accumulated tradition, varied solely to simulate research and to allow full scope for the exercise of the graces of style. Truth forever on the scaffold; Rhetoric forever on the throne: such, except for rare moments when, as if to fan the dying embers of hope, the cause of Truth appears to enjoy a brief triumph, is the sad tale which our author unfolds. In the last chapter of the book, however, which assumes the rôle of the theophany of a *deus ex machina*, Dr. Peter extracts from after ages a prophecy *ex eventu*, allowing the light of Christian teaching and the brilliancy of modern historiography to fall upon the dark backward and abysm of time.

As our author himself well says in his preface, his subject lies along the marches between history proper and the history of literature. Although well-nigh all ancient historians are passed in review, we are concerned neither with their personalities nor with their writings, except to inquire into the truthfulness of the one and the truth of the other. Especial attention is directed to three points: (1) the means employed by the historian in quest of the truth; (2) the steps taken by him to convince the public of his truthfulness and the truth or accuracy of his record; (3) the artistic or conventional devices adopted by him in setting forth the truth to render it convincingly vivid and objective. Under the first head are considered the extent of the historian's direct knowledge and the character and use of such other sources of information as he possessed; under the second, accounts of personal experiences, autopsy, and the citation of authorities, real or fictitious; under the third, such tricks of invention as the introduction of speeches by Thucydides and the rhetorical means employed to lend vividness and the color of truth to the narrative. Thus we pass continually from considerations of style and ethics to questions of fact. As the indication of the historian's sources serves to filiate him with his predecessors, so Dr. Peter's survey, by noting his influence on his successors, assigns him his organic place in the total evolution of tradition. From this it becomes at once obvious how concrete and valuable is this study of ancient historiography to every scholar, whether his primary interest be in political history or in the development of aesthetic and moral ideals. This concreteness of treatment comes out with especial force in contrast with Stemplinger's *Das Plagiat in der griechischen Literatur*, with which by its title it compels comparison. Chap. xiii. of Dr. Peter's book deals with the same subject and every candid reader will prefer its brief, succinct statement to the drawn-out treatise which won the Munich prize.

It is inevitable that in such a book there should be innumerable points

on which specialists will take issue with the author. One who, like the reviewer, is not a specialist and would modestly restrict his claim to competence as a judge to the relatively small field of the chief Greek and Roman historians, must content himself with a question or two. In speaking of Hecataeus (p. 38) and the younger Pherecydes (p. 48), Dr. Peter seems to regard Γενεαλογία as a more correct title than Ἱστορίαι, although neither is in his opinion authentic. This view assumes a radical difference between the terms which did not exist; for Ἱστορία was γενεαλογία (cf. my Περὶ Φύσεως, p. 86, n. 32). Again, our author accepts as genuine (p. 61) the Ἀλεξάνδρον πράξας attributed to Callisthenes, which many, including the writer, hold to be spurious. In the same way he quotes (p. 81) as authentic Democritus, fr. 299 D., which Diels with good reason rejects, and renders γραμμάτων συνθέσις (query: does he propose to read συνέσις?) with "Deutung von Schriftstücken," which Diels is certainly right in translating "Zusammensetzung der Linien." A few bad misprints also occur, as when (p. 62) the death of Callisthenes is dated 357 instead of 327. Many will no doubt challenge Dr. Peter's views (pp. 136 ff.) regarding the *Hellenica Oxyrhynchia*, which he dates before Theopompus. Here the writer is inclined to follow him, however, because he can detect no signs of Isocratean influences on style or method.

The matters discussed in the introductory first chapter, which deals with Greek religion and ethics, are susceptible of very divergent evaluation, depending on the point of view and the temper of the student. To the writer the treatment of the same general theme in Farnell's *The Higher Aspects of Greek Religion* seems to be both more sympathetic and more intelligent. Dr. Peter's discussion compels one to picture him as a German Protestant of the old school who can conceive of moral training in the form only of doctrinal sermons and the regulation *Religionsunterricht*. He has a whole-hearted love of truth and hates a lie with perfect hatred. All rhetoric is *vom Übel*, and his ideal of history is that of the specialist utterly devoted to the dispassionate and methodical determination of the "facts." He accords somewhat reluctantly, perhaps constrained by the recollection of his own boyhood enthusiasm (p. 31), a certain educational value to history depicted in warm colors, which may even now foster a spirit of patriotism. To be sure, he adds, we long ago discarded the favorite ancient means of euphonious language and artistic form. He hardly deplores the loss, though in his final sentence he exclaims: "Glücklich derjenige, der für den Vortrag ihrer [der methodischen Geschichtsforschung] Ergebnisse eine starke Persönlichkeit mitbringt und auch noch die gestaltende Kraft eines Künstlers besitzt, um das ästhetische Gefühl zu befriedigen." It is hardly necessary to add that the book under review, with all its merits, possesses none of the graces of style, which its author views with so much suspicion.

W. A. HEIDEL

WESLEYAN UNIVERSITY

Griechische Forschungen I. Die Nebensätze in den griechischen Dialektinschriften in Vergleich mit den Nebensätzen in der griechischen Literatur, und die Gebildetensprache im Griechischen und Deutschen. Von EDWARD HERMANN. Teubner, 1912. M. 10.

A preface dedicates the work to Professor Berthold Delbrück on his seventieth birthday, and explains the origin of the undertaking and the circumstances attending its execution.

The first chapter, or *Abschnitt* as he calls it, is devoted to a discussion of the question what a *Nebensatz* (subordinate clause) really is. The chapter is largely taken up with a polemic against Dittmar (*Syntaktische Grundfragen*).

The essential part of the work begins with the second chapter. Here are collected examples of every kind of subordinate clause found in the inscriptions of all the dialects except Attic, and Attic is omitted because it is so voluminous and is well provided for by Meisterhans-Schweizer. The subordinating conjunctions and relatives are arranged in alphabetical order, and the countries or cities where the inscriptions were found are named in what we may call geographical order, each dialect forming a separate paragraph. As a rule only one or two examples are cited in each instance. The author follows, in the arrangements of the dialects, A. Thumb, *Dialekte der griechischen Dialekte*:

In the third chapter are illustrated the subordinate clauses in Greek literature. Here the same method is continued, and Attic is represented. The author acknowledges special obligations to Schwarz's *Beiträge* for the material presented in this chapter.

In the fourth chapter is discussed the problem of the relations existing among the various kinds of speech—that of inscriptions, that of literature, the cultivated language, and the speech of the people. The discussion is worth the perusal of all Hellenists. It is divided into sections as follows: A, "The Earlier Language of the Inscriptions"; B, "The Origin of the Spoken Common Language [*Gemeinsprache*] in Ancient Greek and in German"; C, "The Greek Literary Tongues" (*Literatursprachen*). In this chapter the German dialects are discussed and the evolution of the universal written (printed) German investigated. The author describes at length his own experiences as one who in childhood spoke the dialect of Coburg.

The fifth chapter is devoted to the relative pronouns and subordinating conjunctions in the Greek dialects. Here we find no longer the bare citation of examples, but elaborate discussions. The sections are as follows: A, "The Relative Pronouns"; in this section there is a long treatment of the assimilation of the relative; B, "The Local Particles except η "; C, "The Modal and Comparative Particles except η , η "; D, "The Conditional Particles and η , η "; it will be noted that η and not η is purposely written;

in C and D there are long discussions of the usage of several words, notably $\omega\varsigma$ and conditional particles. E, "Explicative Particles"; F, "Temporal Particles"; G, "The Remaining Later Subordinating Particles."

In the sixth chapter is investigated the origin from earlier speech of the relative and the subordinating particles in Greek, or, as the author puts it, "Das Relativum und die Nebensatzpartikeln im Vorurgriechischen."

The work is provided with elaborate tables exhibiting the localities where the various words discussed were used.

This book is the result of enormous labor controlled by sound judgment. The bibliography of the subject is illustrated by a long table of abbreviations.

While this work would not render great service on any single topic, it ought, as a general survey, to be in the hands of every Hellenist who ventures to leave the beaten path of Greek studies.

M. W. H.

Itinerarstudien. VON ANTON ELTER. Bonn: Carl Georgi.

The greater part of this monograph is devoted to an attempt to establish the thesis that the *Antonine Itinerary* in the form in which it has come down to us is a pilgrims' itinerary; that it was arranged with the specific purpose of providing pilgrims and those interested in pilgrimages with a conspectus of the roads by which Jerusalem could be reached from all parts of the Roman Empire. This is a wholly new view of the document, which has always been considered a somewhat defective general road-book of the empire, intended for the use of merchants, officials, and travelers of all sorts and conditions.

Elter does not establish his thesis. Just as in his monograph on Horace's *Donarem pateras*, his arguments, though often plausible and ingenious, rest on evidence that either shows a glaring defect in some detail or is in general too flimsy to be considered seriously. As the first step in his contention he points out that the route from Milan to Palestine in the *Antonine Itinerary* is practically identical with that in the *Itinerarium Burdigalense*, except for the fact that the less important stations (the *mutationes*) are omitted in the former. As the *Itinerarium Burdigalense* is known to have been compiled especially for pilgrims from Bordeaux to Jerusalem in the year 333 A.D., this similarity, in Elter's opinion, furnishes conclusive evidence that the *Antonine Itinerary* also was thrown into its present form for the use of pilgrims. This argument would be of some weight, if it were not for the fact that the similarity between the two itineraries in regard to this route ceases at the very point where for Elter's theory it should be most conspicuous. In the *Antonine Itinerary* this road does not go through to Jerusalem at all, but passing through Caesarea Palestina runs into Egypt. Jerusalem is not the terminus of any of the main routes of the itinerary. It is mentioned only once as a way-station on a relatively unimportant road, and on that occasion is called by its old pagan name Aelia. This fact alone is of sufficient importance to discredit Elter's theory.

G. J. LAING

UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

Der erste platonische Brief. (Sonderabdruck aus *Philologus*, LXXII (N.F. XXVI), erstes Heft.) Von OTTO IMMISCH. Leipzig: Dieterich'sche Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1913. Pp. 41.

It would be claiming too much to affirm that Professor Immisch has here definitely disposed of the vexed question of the Platonic *Letters*. But he clearly indicates the method by which the problem must be attacked and offers the most plausible solution that has yet been proposed. He wastes no time in proving that the *Letters* in their present form could not have been written by Plato. The recent repeated reaffirmation by eminent scholars of the genuineness of the entire *corpus*, including the superstitious mysticism of ii and the disingenuousness of xiii, which Ficinus scorned to translate, is enough to make us despair of the progress of philology. Whatever genuine paragraphs or sentences they may contain, the *Letters* as they stand are the work of a compiler. To understand his work, argues Professor Immisch, we must ascertain his motive. The *Letters* are philosophical epistles, not biographical documents. In the tetralogies they are grouped with the *Laws*, and their intended supplemental relation to the political philosophy of the *Laws* resembles that of the *Epinomis* to the Institution of the Nocturnal Council. A much debated passage of the *Laws*, 739 A ff., distinguishes a first or ideal or paradeigmatic state, a second state, which is the "hypothetical" state of the *Laws*, and a third state-system or political theory which Plato seems to promise to expound, if old age allows. Professor Immisch argues that in Plato's view this third exposition of political theory would treat of the rectification or reformation by counsel or admonition, of existing erroneous or diseased governments. He shows that the *Epistles*, which contain much of this kind of admonition adapted to various political situations, might plausibly be regarded as the fulfilment of this program. That they were in fact so interpreted in later Platonic tradition he proves from Apuleius and a sentence of the so-called, 'Αλκινόου εισαγωγή, XXXIV, which I quote somewhat more fully than he does: ὑπογράφει δὲ καὶ ἄλλας πολιτείας ἐξ ὑποθέσεως, ὧν ἐστὶν ἡ τε ἐν Νόμοις καὶ ἡ ἐκ διορθώσεως ἐν Ἐπιστολαῖς ἢ χρῆται πρὸς τὰς νεοσοικίας πόλεις τὰς ἐν τοῖς Νόμοις. The design indicated by these converging lines of argument he attributes to the compiler of the *Letters*. When was the collection made? Professor Immisch deduces a *terminus post quem* from the first letter, which obviously cannot be attributed either to Plato or to Dion, but which describes, he thinks, a definite historical situation too precisely to be dismissed as a mere rhetorical exercise. He finds this situation exactly reproduced in the relations of the Spartan Dexippus to Dionysius the Elder as described in Diodorus xiii. 85-96, to whom, therefore, he assigns the substance but not the present form of the letter. The rhetoric and display of sophistical erudition are too silly not only for the practical statesman Dexippus, but even for that "Pusillus Thucydides" Philistus. It is the kind of rhetorical *Umstilisierung*

which we look for in the *μειρακιῶδες* and *διατριβικόν* style of Timaeus, and as an ornament of his history composed at Athens after 317, we may plausibly conceive this precious epistle of Dexippus. Thence the compiler of the Platonic *Letters* took it, first because he had no epistles of Plato addressed to the elder Dionysius and, second, because it illustrates a necessary topic of the collection, the warnings, the admonitions to be addressed to one who is about to seize upon a tyranny. The compilation of the *Epistles* falls then somewhere between Timaeus and Aristophanes in the first half of the third century. The probable motive and the possible source of each letter are subjects for special investigations and the hypothesis of genuineness must be studied separately for each case, nay for each sentence.

Such are the main conclusions of this interesting paper, the value of which to the inquirer in this field is quite independent of his adhesion to some of its more venturesome combinations.

PAUL SHOREY

UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

